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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Given the significant transformations in services to newcomers in Hamilton in the last 18 months, it should not be surprising that the most significant gap left is a knowledge gap. Many newcomers in Hamilton are not aware of all of the supports and programs for which they are eligible, and service providers often do not have all the information they need to confidently refer newcomer clients when they do become connected to services.

Since the closure in early 2011 of Hamilton’s main provider of settlement services, more agencies are delivering services to newcomers and they are doing so with fewer resources and under new regulations. At the same time, newcomers are generally taking longer to settle in our community as measured by levels of employment, income and health status compared to Canadian born residents.

The purposes of the Strengthening Newcomer Services initiative are to identify and communicate who does what in the newcomer services system, and to build a case for what needs to be done and how to go about it, all with the aim of achieving a better system for newcomer services in Hamilton. Stakeholders from government, service providers, and newcomer communities were consulted using a variety of methods, including: an initial gathering to gather feedback project goals and plans; a marketplace event for frontline service providers; focus groups held with newcomer communities; an online survey of service providers; and a gathering of focus group participants to collect feedback on findings and recommendations.

Key findings include:

- Awareness of services is the biggest gap among both service providers and newcomers. Many newcomers do not have accessible information about available services, and service providers need more and better information to confidently refer newcomer clients.
- Language is the most significant barrier experienced by newcomers, especially as it relates to employment, health, and housing.
- Experiences of discrimination were common among newcomers.
- Service providers are building collaboration through their involvement with the Hamilton Immigration Partnership Council (HIPC).
- Many newcomers find the current arrangement of services – with no one-stop shop organization – confusing.
- All stakeholders consulted acknowledged that newcomers tend to go to family, friends, religious and/or ethno-cultural associations first for information and support when settling in Hamilton.

In a series of recommendations, this report recommends that the capacity of informal networks, often the first point of contact for newcomers, be supported and strengthened in order to bridge the gaps in awareness between newcomers and formal services.

A web tool for accessing more comprehensive information about services for newcomers has also been enhanced and redesigned: www.welcometohamilton.ca.

Partners in this initiative have also produced a Quick Guide of Services for Newcomers, which will be available in 11 languages. As they are released, they will be available at www.welcometohamilton.ca.
1.0 CONTEXT

Strengthening Newcomer Services emerged as a community response to the significant changes in services to newcomers in Hamilton associated with the closure of the Settlement and Integration Services Organization (SISO). The Social Planning and Research Council and Workforce Planning Hamilton gathered interested funders, service planners, policy makers, and service providers to discuss and gauge the appetite for a community response to the changes. Through these discussions, an application was submitted to the Ontario Trillium Foundation’s new Rapid Response granting stream to support such a community response. The application proposed a collaborative project to facilitate broad community consultation in order to provide information, identify gaps, and make recommendations for a more responsive settlement service system in Hamilton. The Ontario Trillium Foundation saw the value in such an initiative and generously supported it.

The Hamilton Immigration Partnership Council, as a collaborative of community leaders focused on the coordination of services and the successful integration of newcomers, was a natural key partner in leading this work. Key partnerships were also established with Community Information Hamilton and the Hamilton Centre for Civic Inclusion to help lead this project.

Recent demographic information on newcomers in gives a picture of who is arriving in Hamilton. In 2010 Hamilton received 4,003 permanent residents; in 2011 this number dipped to 3,296. Of the permanent residents who arrived in Hamilton in 2010, nearly 30% were refugees; 23.1% were in the family class, 16.5% were economic immigrants (principal applicants), 24.9% were economic immigrants (spouses and dependents), and 5.7% were in other immigration classes. The top 10 countries of origin for newcomers to Hamilton from 2006-2010 (in descending order) were: the Philippines, India, People’s Republic of China, Iraq, United States of America, Colombia, Pakistan, United Kingdom and Colonies, United Arab Emirates, and Democratic Republic of Somalia. While approximately 70% of newcomers to Hamilton from 2006-2010 spoke one or both of English and French, the top five mother tongues were Arabic, English, Spanish, Tagalog, and Punjabi.

While Hamilton is receiving a shrinking proportion of newcomers to Canada (relative to other communities), the city’s population is aging, and newcomers disproportionately experience poverty despite being three times as likely as Canadian born residents to have a university degree. Newcomers are also in Canada for an average of 20 years before reaching economic parity with Canadian born residents (compared with 3-5 years in the 1980s). For these and other reasons, the Hamilton Immigration Partnership Council is working to build commitment from partners across the city to embed shared responsibility for the welcoming and integration of newcomers. Still, many newcomers succeed in Hamilton, and newcomers’ contributions to our community are fundamental to our city’s present and future wellbeing.

Simultaneously, beyond the significant change of SISO’s closure that spurred this project, the context of Hamilton’s system of newcomer services has continued to change through the course of this project. Provincial and federal governments have recently made policy changes that will affect the landscape of

---

3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
services available to newcomers. For example, provincially funded Job Discovery Centres (who serve not just newcomers but the broader community) will close on July 31, 2012\(^9\). Federal changes to the Interim Federal Health Program (IFHP)\(^{10}\), the elimination of backlogged applications to the Federal Skilled Worker Program\(^{11}\), and the temporary pause on receiving applications for the Federal Skilled Worker Program\(^{12}\) are all factors in the changing policy landscape in which this project has taken place. Impacts of these policy changes are not captured in this report, but certainly warrant further exploration in the future to build understanding and improvement of services to newcomers in Hamilton.

1.1 Premises

The project partners held several shared premises on which the work of the project was built. The first of these is that the project should be focused on how newcomers address their needs, which literature shows is through informal networks\(^{13}\) of family, friends, and ethno-cultural communities. The vision for this project is a different way of doing business in our community with newcomers, a way that strengthens relationships between informal and formal services and builds the capacity of newcomer communities themselves to participate in this change. With this long-term vision established, the project sought to gather and share learnings and recommendations to support the realization of the project vision. Moving forward, strategies are needed to support the formal settlement services in empowering the informal sector to be more integrated stakeholders in developing and evaluating the newcomer service system. The value added from this project is that it has consulted both with formal service providers and informal networks.

1.2 Goals

A central goal of this initiative is to build and strengthen relationships between these two broad types of supports available to newcomers in our community. The project strives for better outcomes for newcomers through better integration between services and better input from newcomers into shaping services. The Strengthening Newcomer Services project seeks to:

- enhance responsiveness of the existing settlement service system;
- inform sector community planning initiatives and collaboratives of project findings in order to promote the inclusion of newcomers in community development, system and service delivery improvements in Hamilton; and
- engage communities as an integral part of the system of services for newcomers, and have newcomers themselves be a part of the change and act as change agents in communities.

\(^{13}\) Informal networks is used throughout this report to refer to the whole of family, friends, faith-based communities, ethno-cultural groups, and other organizations that are not publicly funded to provide services to newcomers. We acknowledge that there is a range of formality among these groups, and that some are formalized and incorporated non-profit organizations.
1.3 Deliverables

Based on these premises, and in pursuit of this vision, the project partnership team set out several deliverables as measures of success:

- Improved information and data on the system of services for immigrants and newcomers in Hamilton from consultations and improvements to the database of newcomer services through Community Information Hamilton
- Updated information on the new system of settlement services in Hamilton
- Quick reference guides, in several languages, as a quick reference to settlement services for both newcomers and service providers
- Increased awareness of community services responding to immigrant and newcomer populations
- Two community events to engage the community around improving services to newcomers
- Focus group discussions of newcomers to increase participation and enhance understandings of integration and coordination efforts
- Improved formal and informal network relationships among groups, agencies and services providing support to newcomers
- A report on activities and findings in assessing knowledge, awareness, relationships, experiences, and needs in newcomer services in Hamilton
- Recommendations for change that will support efforts to strengthen the local system of services supporting newcomers

These deliverables are revisited and discussed in section 6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations.

This report proceeds by describing the methods of data collection and engagement through the project (section 2.0 Methods) and then presenting findings from each phase (sections 3.0 and 4.0, Formal and Informal Service Provider Consultation Findings, respectively). Findings and emerging themes are then discussed in section 5.0 Discussion, followed by section 6.0 Conclusions and Recommendations. References can be found in section 7.0 References, and summaries of all event evaluations are presented in Appendix 1. Appendix 2 offers a map of recent newcomer settlement patterns in Hamilton.
2.0 METHODS

This section describes the methods used to collect information about services for newcomers in Hamilton. Stakeholders were consulted through six distinct phases of research. These phases consisted of:

1. An initial half-day event that gathered community partners from service provider organizations and government to gather advice about the direction and aims of the project (June 2011)
2. A Marketplace event for frontline service providers with speakers, opportunities for networking, and an interactive survey focused on knowledge of services and referrals (October 2011)
3. A series of focus groups with 9 communities of newcomers in Hamilton focusing on local experiences of services for newcomers and recommendations for improving the system (November 2011-January 2012)
4. An online survey of service providers focusing on language interpretation and translation (January-February 2012)
5. A follow-up event with newcomers from the focus groups to gather feedback on focus group findings (March 2012)
6. A wrap-up event to report back to all project participants and the broader community about findings and accomplishments, and to share information tools developed through the project, described further below (May 2012).

Each of the four events were also evaluated by participants (phases 1, 2, 5, and 6 above). Summaries of all evaluations are provided in Appendix 1.

In addition to the research-focused aspects of this initiative, project partners also met regularly to discuss and plan project development, and to review evaluation findings to guide the project. Partners also worked collaboratively to produce a Quick Guide of information about services for newcomers, which is being translated into 10 languages (besides English) and will be available as electronic documents at www.welcometohamilton.ca. This is also the site of an enhanced online information tool for newcomers and service providers created by Community Information Hamilton. (The original newcomer information website was produced in partnership with HIPC and was enhanced through this project.) The site was launched at the closing event in May 2012.

Initial Gathering

Over 40 community partners representing over 25 organizations and departments participated in the initial half-day event of the Strengthening Newcomer Services project held in the morning on June 29, 2011 at LIUNA Station in Hamilton. Participants included representatives from three orders of government, service providing agencies, funders, and other community organizations.

The event began with opening remarks from project partners from Workforce Planning Hamilton, the Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton, and the Hamilton Immigration Partnership Council. Together, these comments highlighted the crucial importance of immigration to Hamilton’s current and future prosperity, emphasized the benefits of collaboration between partners across the community, and introduced the project partners and objectives.

Participants were presented with the following project objectives:
1. To achieve a better system for newcomer services in Hamilton.
2. To identify and communicate who does what in the newcomer services system.
3. To build a case for what needs to be done and how to go about it.

Participants were then divided into groups for small group discussions, in which the following questions were addressed:
1. What is your feedback on the objectives on this project? What would you add?
2. Who do we need to talk to and how?
3. What information, data, resources, or reports do you need to gain a full understanding of our local system?
Groups reported back one important point from the smaller discussion to the larger group. Participants also circulated through the room and signed up their names and organizations on charts with various sectors of services that newcomers might access, creating a kind of “network map.”

The event also included a presentation of the Community Information Hamilton data that would be used as a way to make information about services more accessible to newcomers and service providers, highlighting that a “one-stop shop” is not the only way to share information when most stakeholders are able to connect with each other in a way that is quick and easy.

**Marketplace Event**

On October 21, 2011, frontline service providers serving newcomers came together for a marketplace and networking event at the Scottish Rite in Hamilton. Two sessions with the same program were offered during the day, one in the morning and the other in the afternoon, to accommodate as many participants as possible. Service providers had booths set up in a marketplace style to share information and learn about one another’s services. Several speakers each focused on a particular issue or area of service to newcomers.

Also at the event, participants responded to a survey throughout the event using Instametrics technology: Questions are projected on a screen and respondents select answers on individual electronic survey devices. Results are tallied and displayed in real time. The survey focused on service providers’ knowledge and confidence in making referrals to other services, and also included some demographic questions. The largest number of responses to one question in the survey was 189. This number was used as the denominator for calculating the percentages of participants who did not answer each question (see results in Section 3.2).

Finally, participants helped to populate a “system map.” The names of organizations who registered for the event were printed in coded colours to represent different sectors. Participants were asked to pin their organization name in the most appropriate colour (defined by the participant) to a map of Hamilton that showed the approximate geographic concentration of newcomers to Hamilton from 2001 to 2006.

**Focus Groups**

The third phase of data collection consisted of focus groups with newcomer community members to hear more about their experiences, challenges, and suggestions about how to improve services for newcomers in Hamilton. The Hamilton Centre for Civic Inclusion (HCCI) coordinated all focus groups, bringing together participants, materials, and project staff. Project staff consulted with nine communities from November 2011 to January 2012, roughly 75 people total. Eight consultations were focus groups with participation ranging from 5 to 13 people. A focus group with Francophone newcomers was cancelled due to insufficient registration; instead, several individual Francophone newcomers were interviewed using the same questions as in the focus groups.

The aim was to consult a range of communities that included groups that form a significant proportion of Hamilton’s newcomer population, as well as smaller groups that experience more isolation because of language or other factors. Thus, the communities consulted were not all communities with the largest proportion of Hamilton’s population

Diversity in terms of country of origin, religion, culture, and language was emphasized. Two focus groups were conducted with women only in order to more fully reflect women’s unique experiences of immigration in Hamilton. Groups consisted of newcomer participants from: two Hamilton Mosques, one of which was with women only; the Somali community (women only); the Spanish community; Francophone communities; the Chinese seniors community; Eastern European communities; the Karen community; and the Filipino community.
Outreach to potential focus group participants began with project staff contacting members of various communities through their existing networks to identify leaders in newcomer communities. In most focus groups the main contact person for each community also provided interpretation for the focus group, and received an honorarium for their time. The leaders from each community recruited participants, and worked with project staff to determine appropriate logistics. Project staff organized locations, food, child care, and bus tickets, while community leaders focused on recruiting note takers, interpreters, and participants. The focus group with Eastern European newcomer communities was organized in collaboration with a local agency with a concentration of Eastern European clients, and the focus group was held on-site. Similarly, a focus group with Francophone newcomers was organized in collaboration with staff from a Francophone community organization; unfortunately, because of lack of registration, the focus group was cancelled. Instead, individual interviews with Francophone newcomers were scheduled. These interviewees were recommended by the organization with whom the focus group was initially scheduled.

All focus groups were scheduled in consultation with key contacts in each community to maximize participation; as a result, five focus groups were held on Saturdays, and two on weekday evenings. Members from the remaining two communities were able to participate during weekdays. (Times of day and days of the week proved to be a more significant issue in this initiative than anticipated.)

Focus group participants were informed that their participation was voluntary, that their identity would be confidential, and that they could withdraw at any time. Interpreters were present to interpret between English and the languages spoken by participants. In some focus groups, participants indicated that interpretation was not necessary and that the focus group could be conducted in English. Participants completed optional, anonymous demographic surveys. In this survey, some participants indicated that they were born in Canada and were therefore not newcomers. Their responses were not included for analysis. Notes were taken in English by a note taker fluent in the language in which the focus group was being conducted.

In order to make the focus groups as accessible as possible, food was provided, bus tickets offered, child care made available when participants registered in advance, and modest gift cards were offered to thank participants for their time. Several focus groups were held at HCCI. Other locations included religious institutions and a shelter.

Questions focused on newcomers’ experiences; what brought them to Hamilton, where and how they first received information about services for newcomers, how they prefer to receive information, experiences with both formal and informal groups offering support as well as referrals, challenges, and suggestions of what would make the biggest difference in helping them settle in Hamilton. Notes taken during the focus groups were then analyzed using qualitative analysis software (DeDoose). Notes were coded by theme using this software.

Because this project consulted with larger proportions of refugees and women than exist in the total newcomer population in Hamilton, project findings may not reflect all of the experiences and service needs for all newcomer groups. Certainly different groups of newcomers often have different needs. All newcomers have important perspectives to contribute to service planning and community integration in Hamilton. Still, from an anti-oppression perspective, focusing on the experiences of more marginalized groups reflects a commitment to including voices beyond ‘the usual suspects’ who are often excluded from public consultations because of the relatively small size of their community or because they are harder to reach. From this perspective, this project has aimed to balance consultations with larger percentages of Hamilton’s newcomer population and groups that are more marginalized, yielding a sample of participants that is not perfectly representative of all Hamilton newcomers.14 Ongoing consultation with newcomers would provide greater depth and substance to our community’s evolving newcomer integration strategy. The Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants (OCASI)’s report,

---

14 Further consultations could be done as part of future initiatives with newcomer youth as they play a significant role in settlement through language interaction, often acting as a family spokesperson. Dynamics and impacts of this have been studied but not at a local level.
Making Ontario Home: A study of settlement and integration services for immigrants and refugees also offers important recent data on immigrants and newcomers’ use of services in Ontario and should be explored thoroughly as local work on newcomer services moves forward\(^{15}\).

**Service Provider Survey**

Service providers were consulted again in January and February, 2012, through an online survey that focused on details of language interpretation, translation, and other ‘softer’ services available from service providing organizations. The focus on language interpretation and translation in particular emerged from preliminary focus group findings, which highlighted the profound barriers experienced by some newcomers when trying to access services, often when newcomers had some knowledge of English or French. The primary goal of the survey to gain a deeper understanding from service providers of what kinds of language supports are available to clarify potential gaps between services offered and newcomer communities’ awareness of such services.

Preliminary focus group findings also suggested that newcomers often did not know where to access services available to them. Services offering free use of telephones, computers, and individualized transit information can help make a newcomer’s experience at a service providing organization useful even if the direct, formal service offered there does not fit with their needs. Such supports may also help newcomers gain greater capacity around meeting their needs and learning about other services. For this reason, the survey also asked service providers about such supports.

The final aspect of the survey sought to gauge service providers’ interest in a common referral form. A common referral form refers to a single form that could be used by all agencies and organizations offering services to newcomers to make referrals between organizations. The usefulness of such a form was discussed as one potential tool to support connections between agencies in the new context of services to newcomers being provided by multiple agencies across the community. Before any such tool could or should be developed, though, project partners sought a better understanding of service providers’ perspectives on this concept. Thus, the topic was included in the service provider survey.

The survey was circulated by email to registrants from the October Marketplace event, and participants were encouraged to circulate it through their networks. The survey yielded 47 responses. Quantitative results were analyzed using the online survey software, while qualitative responses were coded manually by theme.

**Follow-up Event with Focus Group Participants**

All focus group participants were invited back to a collective meeting in the afternoon of on March 31, 2012, at the YWCA Seniors Centre. The objectives of this meeting were twofold: 1) to reflect back what was heard in focus group consultations and verify and adjust these findings with the group; 2) to circulate drafts of quick guides of information for newcomers and get feedback on them from participants. A summary of findings and the draft quick guide were presented and discussed in small groups where notes were taken by the facilitators and/or note takers from the focus groups. Project staff also circulated through each table to collect additional comments. Both the event and the quick guide itself were evaluated by participants. (See Appendix 1 for summaries of all evaluations.)

**Closing Event with Service Providers and Newcomers**

A closing event that brought together focus group participants and service providers as well as other community members was held at the Hamilton Convention Centre on May 31, 2012. Service providers of varying degrees of formality set up information booths and had opportunities to share information and network throughout the event. The mayor of Hamilton, and representatives from the Ontario Trillium Foundation and a local Member of Provincial Parliament’s office offered thoughts about immigration in

Hamilton and congratulations to project partners. A preliminary version of the Quick Guide of information for newcomers was shared with attendees. Community Information Hamilton gave a demonstration of the newly enhanced newcomer information database on Inform Hamilton, found at www.welcometohamilton.ca. Key findings and highlights of recommendations were also presented.

Limitations

As in all social research, collecting comprehensive and representative information is challenging. While we have undertaken as robust a consultation process as our time and resources would allow, we have not captured the perspective of every newcomer or every service provider in Hamilton.

While project partners are deeply grateful to the Ontario Trillium Foundation for its support of this initiative, the scope of the project has been limited by available resources. Project partners have given many in-kind hours to bring the project to fruition. With limited resources, this project offers a snapshot in time of perspectives around the system of services for newcomers in Hamilton.

It is also important to note that the primary objectives of this project were not research based; instead, action research (inquiring and intervening simultaneously) was a method through which the project objectives of bringing people together to share information to strengthen the system of services for newcomers were achieved. With this approach, methodologies developed as the project progressed and later stages of inquiry and action often built on learnings from earlier stages.

This report also identifies clearly that there is more work to be done. Consultation, outreach, and service planning should continue to involve as many service providers and newcomers as possible on an ongoing basis throughout our community in order to build a strong, responsive, and holistic service system.

The following sections discuss findings yielded from each of the methods described here.
3.0 FORMAL SERVICE PROVIDER CONSULTATION FINDINGS

This section discusses findings from the three phases of consultations with service providers: the initial meeting with community partners, the Marketplace event for frontline service providers, and the online service provider survey.

3.1 Initial Community Partner Consultation Findings

This section highlights key points emerging from the small group discussions that took place at the initial community partner event held in June 2011. (For discussion questions, see Section 2.0 Methods.)

Key points emerging from discussions

- All service providers, not just those focused on newcomer communities must hold a broad understanding of integration and create a welcoming environment for newcomers to improve and quicken newcomer inclusion and integration.
- Participants emphasized the importance of having this initiative connected with the Hamilton Immigration Partnership Council.
- Better information is needed about who is doing what in terms of newcomer services, both to understand more clearly what we already have as a community and to utilize it better. From there needs can be identified. Participants were encouraged to contact their local YMCA in the meantime.
- Key stakeholders should be identified before consulting with them.
- When referring clients, service providers should ensure clients are going to see a specific person rather than simply an agency.
- Newcomers themselves must be part of identifying gaps and generating ideas for service improvements. Ensure newcomer consultation in this process. Knowing how to engage informal networks can be a challenge.
- There is recognition of the way that information is passed around through friends, family, places of worship; this initiative should work with that knowledge, with communities being served, and with informal groups.
- Communicate with people in different ways: group settings, e-survey, a variety of methods.

Many of these reflections and recommendations were incorporated into the framing and development of this project. For example, Strengthening Newcomer Services is now a working group of the Hamilton Immigration Partnership Council. Further, several members of the Strengthening Newcomer Services team also sit on other HIPC working groups and committees.

Network Map

Participants were also invited to help generate a snapshot of who was in the room, a kind of “network map.” In this exercise, participants were asked to visit and record their names on sheets of chart paper around the room under each sector within newcomer services in which they work: housing, employment, education, documentation and language training. Names and organizations for each sector are listed as recorded by participants on these sheets.

Education:
Sue-Ann Ward – HARRRP
Sabaah Choudhary – YWCA
Judith Ngan – HWDSB
Judith Bishop – HWDSB
Lily Lumsden – YMCA
Kerry Lubrick – City of Hamilton
While the sample of service providers present at this event is quite small relative to the total number of service providers across the city, a few points emerging from this exercise are worth noting. First, a range of organization types are working within each sector, including multiple levels of government, larger service providing organizations, smaller community-based organizations, and post-secondary institutions. Each of these organizations has its own set of accountabilities, which can make close collaboration challenging. Second, several participants are listed under multiple sectors, highlighting the complexity of services within an organization.
3.2 Service Provider Survey Findings Part I: October

At the Frontline Service Provider Marketplace event in October, an interactive audience survey technology called Instametrics collected participant responses to questions about their work. This section briefly describes and analyzes relevant findings from the Instametrics survey.

Chart 1 below shows the distribution of participants by the sector in which they work primarily.

**Chart 1: Service provider representation by sector**

![Bar chart showing service provider representation by sector]

The largest grouping of responses is in the "Other" category, suggesting that many participants did not identify their services as clearly fitting into any one of the other sectors. This may be partly a function of the fact that many service provider agencies offer multiple types of services.

Chart 2 shows the distribution of service provider respondents by the length of time they have worked in their current sector. Most respondents (28%) have been in their sectors for 10 or more years, while nearly a quarter (23%) have been in their sectors for just 1-3 years. Adding the first two categories together, 40% of respondents have been in their sectors for 3 years or less. With this range of experience among service providers, there may be more opportunities for mentorship, networking, and/or information sharing among the more and less experienced providers. The Downtown Brown Bag Lunch series for service providers is an example of an ongoing initiative for such opportunities.
Despite the slight concentration of more experienced service providers shown in Chart 2, a lower percentage of respondents (19%) indicated that they had worked at their current agencies for 10 or more years (see Chart 3 below). A quarter of respondents said that they had worked at their agencies for less than a year, which may be a function of the closure of a major settlement service provider agency in the year prior to the survey, many of whom are now working at other agencies. This may also suggest a more general pattern of service providers moving agencies but still working in a given sector.

Chart 3: Service providers’ length of time working at current agency

Chart 4 below shows that the vast majority (71%) of respondents were frontline service providers, which was the target audience for this particular event.
Most service provider respondents (56%) said that newcomer clients usually need a referral, while an additional 32% said clients occasionally needed a referral. A slightly smaller majority (52%) said that they could not readily find all the information they need to confidently refer their newcomer clients. Responses to these two questions were cross-tabulated and are shown in Chart 5 below.

**Chart 5: Crosstab - Service providers can readily find information to refer confidently & prevalence of clients needing referrals**

From Chart 5, we see that among service providers, those who indicated that their newcomer clients needed referrals occasionally (as opposed to usually) were slightly more likely to feel that they did not have sufficient information to confidently make necessary referrals. Overall, though, only about 40% of...
service providers who answered both questions felt they could readily find the information needed to refer their newcomer clients confidently.

When looking for information to assist with referrals, nearly two-thirds (63%) of service providers usually use the internet. The next two most common responses were other service providers (10%) and print materials such as brochures, directories, or the phone book (8%).

When asked what method of finding services would be most useful to their newcomer clients, over three-quarters of service providers indicated that a printed booklet in multiple languages and verbally in-person would be most useful (each option was selected by 38% of respondents). For 9% of respondents, websites with multiple language links would be most useful to their clients, while another 4% of respondents said that verbally by telephone would be most useful for clients.

To gauge where particular challenges in offering service might be, service providers were asked which immigration class was most difficult to find services for. The most common class cited by far was refugee claimants, given by 46% of respondents.

Chart 6: Service provider perceptions of service areas most difficult for newcomers to find

Service providers also identified that particular kinds of service can also be more difficult for newcomers to find, as seen in Chart 6 above.

Employment services were by far the most common response (37%), followed by credential recognition (14%), which is related to securing employment in one’s field. A further 10% of respondents identified health care services as most difficult to find, followed by other services (10%), and housing (8%). Settlement, language training, and other educational services were each identified as most difficult by 2-3% of respondents.

A key question when talking about services for newcomers is where newcomers actually seek out support, which was asked of service providers (see Chart 7 below).
Most respondents (51%) felt that newcomers go first to family and friends for support. Roughly one-eighth (12%) of respondents identified formal service providers and government offices as the first stop for newcomers. Ethno-cultural communities and faith communities were identified by 5% and 2% of respondents, respectively. However, grouping family and friends, ethno-cultural communities, and faith communities together – each category falls within the concept of “informal networks” – nearly 60% of respondents point to such groups as the first places newcomers seek support.

Service providers were also asked how knowledgeable they considered themselves to be with respect to making referrals in the following sectors: settlement, housing, language training, health care, and employment. Table 1 below summarizes the findings from this question, highlighting the highest and lowest percentages for each level of knowledge and listing the sector of service in which that percentage of respondents occurred.

**Table 1: Summary of service provider identified knowledge levels in various sectors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Somewhat Knowledgeable</th>
<th>Limited Knowledge</th>
<th>No Knowledge At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest %</strong></td>
<td>27% (Employment)</td>
<td>39% (Settlement)</td>
<td>30% (Health Care)</td>
<td>8% (Housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lowest %</strong></td>
<td>10% (Health care)</td>
<td>31% (Employment)</td>
<td>15% (Language)</td>
<td>1% (Settlement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each service sector, most respondents indicated they were somewhat knowledgeable, and these proportions ranged from 31-39% of respondents. The highest percentage of respondents who considered themselves very knowledgeable was 27%, which occurred in employment services. This is particularly interesting given that service providers also indicated that employment services were the most difficult for newcomers to find (see Chart 6 above). This indicates that although service providers generally feel knowledgeable about making employment service referrals, such services are still difficult for newcomers to find. This may be a reflection of employment being a crucial aspect in settling long-term, or perhaps of
barriers that newcomers face in trying to find employment services despite the high level of service provider knowledge in the area.

The highest proportion of “limited knowledge” responses (30%) came in the area of health care, while the lowest proportion of this category was in language (15%). Health care was also the sector in which the lowest proportion of respondents indicated that they were very knowledgeable (10%). This suggests that service providers could benefit from more information training or orientation about health care services for newcomers.

Housing was the sector for which the highest proportion of respondents (8%) indicated that they had no knowledge at all. This suggests that some introductory information about housing services for newcomers could benefit this small but important group of providers so that such vital information can reach their newcomer clients.

3.2.1 System Map

Service provider participants at the Marketplace event in October 2011 were also invited to mark the locations of their services on a map of Hamilton that showed the concentration of recent immigrants. Organization names were printed in multiple colours, each corresponding to a given sector, which were then selected by participants and placed on the map (see below). (Service providers whose services are mobile in the community placed their organization names in the margin of the map.)

Figure 1: System Map
Because this exercise was performed manually rather than digitally, no formal analysis of the system map was undertaken. Still, the photo above shows that many services are concentrated in the downtown core of Hamilton, as are many newcomers. A significant concentration of both newcomers and services is also located in east Hamilton/Stoney Creek near Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway. Many services are located along Upper James Street on Hamilton Mountain, and many recent immigrants are settled across the Mountain. Whether services and newcomers are matched in terms of eligibility and type of service is not clear. The exercise itself also provided an opportunity for interaction and networking between service providers.

3.3 Service Provider Survey Findings Part II: January-February

This section highlights findings from the online survey of service providers conducted through January and February, 2012.

The survey had 47 respondents, which is significantly less than the number of participants in the first service provider survey conducted at the Marketplace event in October 2011. Still, the number is not insignificant and some lessons can be gleaned from the results.

Representatives from 18 separate organizations responded, not including many distinct programs and departments within several of these organizations.

Clients can get service in at least 45 languages from the represented organizations combined. (One respondent indicated that service was available in 90 languages, though these were not listed.) Some of these languages are spoken by staff members; in other cases interpreters and translators are hired; in still others free online translation through Google Translate is used.

Respondents were asked a series of questions related to Language Line Services, a 24-hour, multi-language telephone interpretation service. Organizations can establish accounts, and can then call an 800 number to access a professional interpreter. Interpreters then interpret conversations between two parties. Organizations are billed on a per-minute basis once the interpreter comes on the line.

Two-thirds (67%) of respondents were not aware of the Language Line. Over half of respondents (54%) said their organization did not use Language Line services, while 9.1% said that theirs did. The remaining 34% were unsure. 43% of respondents said they would consider using Language Line Services, while 2% said they would not consider it. Over half of respondents (54%) said they didn’t know whether or not they would consider it. (This may be because such decisions would be made at other levels of management within their organizations.)

Funding was the most cited barrier to using Language Line Services, with 3 out of 4 respondents identifying it. 43% said that knowledge of the service was a barrier, and 28% cited staff time/capacity. Several other responses to the question of barriers indicated that the service would not be suitable for their services, whether because they do not deal directly with newcomers, demand is limited, the service is limited, or is otherwise inappropriate.

Nearly 57% of respondents use in-person translation or interpretation services, while 36% do not and 68% did not know if their organization used such services. Of those who do use these services, most listed Interpretation and Translation Services Hamilton (ITS) or their own staff members as providing interpretation/translation services. Other organizations mentioned include Niagara Interpretation Services, Laurier Translation, Public Health, and Centre de santé communautaire Hamilton-Niagara.

Interpretation and translation is funded in various ways: some organizations provide interpretation in-house or budget for a limited level of service; clients must pay for interpretation themselves at others; at some organizations clients must meet certain criteria related to income or experience; and several organizations reported that their interpretation or translation services were supported by government funders and/or fundraising.
Three-quarters (75%) of respondents serve clients who are accompanied by translators/interpreters. Of those, about half (47%) said that interpretation was a mix of formal and informal, 26% was informal only (family member or friend), and 12% was formal only (paid interpreter). (The remainder of respondents did not know whether interpretation was formal or informal.)

Most respondents (87%) reported that clients are able to use telephones for free at their organizations, and the rest were unsure. Most organizations had terms for telephone use such as only allowing local calls, or calls that are directly related to job searching or other specific purposes. Some organizations offer telephone access only to their clients, or only in cases of emergency.

A lower but still significant proportion (66%) of respondents indicated that clients can use computers for free at their organizations, while 26% said that clients were not allowed to use computers. A further 8% of respondents were unsure. Computer use often must be related to employment or education. Some organizations require clients to sign in to use computers, and some sites are not allowed.

The vast majority of respondents (92%) indicated that clients could get individual transportation information. A further 8% were unsure. Most respondents indicated that this kind of support either had no conditions or was available as needed.

Nearly 7 out of 10 (69.2%) of respondents said that a common referral form that could be shared among service providers would help lead to better outcomes for newcomer clients. A quarter of respondents were unsure, and 5% of respondents did not think such a form would be useful.

Respondents indicated that a common referral form for employment service providers exists already, which could be used as a possible template for services to newcomers. Refugee claimants and convention refugees were also identified as under serviced groups with limited access to employment supports; some respondents felt that for this reason refugee claimants would not benefit greatly from a common referral form. Some suggested that a common referral form may be complicated and unhelpful for clients in general. Some respondents were unsure about a common referral form and sought more detail about this possibility, suggesting that such a form would need to be part of a larger protocol agreed to by service providers.

3.4 Key Findings – Formal Service Provider Consultations

Based on the data presented in this section, the following points emerge as key findings:

- Frontline service providers valued opportunities for face-to-face networking (as indicated in event evaluations and anecdotally).
- Service providers prefer collaborative service planning that is linked to the Hamilton Immigration Partnership Council rather than creating a table that duplicates such work.
- There is a role for all stakeholders – service providers of all kinds, informal networks, government, and the broader community – in integration and inclusion of newcomers.
- Most service providers (56%) reported that newcomer clients they serve usually need referrals.
- Most service providers (52%) reported that they cannot readily find all the information needed to confidently refer newcomer clients.
- Most service providers go to the internet for information in order to refer clients.
- Most service providers felt that newcomers themselves first went to family and friends for information and support.
- Service providers felt most knowledgeable in employment services, which is also the area they identified as the most difficult service type for newcomers to find.
- Health care had the lowest percentage of service providers who considered themselves to be very knowledgeable and the highest percentage of service providers who said they had knowledge.
- Housing drew the highest percentage of service providers indicating that they had now knowledge at all in the area.
• Most service providers are generally concentrated in the lower city, as are recent immigrants, although newcomers and service providers are also located throughout the city.
• Substantial interpretation of various kinds is available at most service providing organizations.
• Service providers indicated little awareness of the Language Line, though many were interested in it. Funding, awareness, and lack of time/staff capacity were the most common barriers to its use identified.
• Most service provider organizations offer some phone and computer use with some restrictions, as well as individualized transit information.
• Nearly 70% of service providers supported a common referral form.
4.0 INFORMAL SERVICE PROVIDER CONSULTATION FINDINGS

Through focus groups and interviews with nine newcomer communities in Hamilton, we spoke with roughly 75 community members. These consultations are described as being with informal service providers, which is a term that needs some explanation. Research literature, newcomers’ experiences, and responses from formal service providers all confirm that newcomers typically rely on support first from family, friends, and/or ethno-cultural communities – or, what in this report is called informal networks. But rather than informal and formal networks being clearly distinct entities, there is a continuum of informal and formal support. Individuals and groups in informal networks have the flexibility to respond to diverse unpredictable and urgent needs, but may not always have the capacity to offer such a level of service and support predictably or indefinitely. For example, a newcomer may get a ride to a doctor’s appointment or to look for housing from someone in their ethno-cultural community. As s/he becomes more settled in Hamilton, that newcomer may in turn offer support to other newcomers in similar ways in the future. More formal services can offer stability and structure, but may not be able to offer all of the pieces of support required in a given newcomer’s situation. Faith communities often fall somewhere in the middle of this continuum, often sharing the faith and language of groups of newcomers and being able to offer some flexibility in supports, but also having some infrastructure that is more established than individuals may have access to. Informal services may also become more formal over time. Because of this wide spectrum of supports with shifting roles within what is called informal networks, participants in this group of consultations are called informal service providers.

This section proceeds by outlining some demographic characteristics of focus group participants for this project. It moves on to discuss findings from the focus groups themselves, as well as feedback and additional recommendations from focus group participants collected at an event that brought participants together. This section then concludes by highlighting key findings from informal service provider consultations.

4.1 Demographics of Focus Group Participants

Of the 75 newcomers who participated in focus groups, 65 participants completed an anonymous demographic survey. The following summary offers a collective impression of focus group participants.

The median year of arrival in Canada among participants was 2007, and participants’ median age was 42 years. More participants were female (n = 41) than male (n = 24). This was mostly because two focus groups were conducted with women only.

Participants heralded from the following 22 countries of origin (in alphabetical order):

Albania
Burma
Cameroon
China
Colombia
France
Haiti
Hungary
India
Iraq
Kosovo
Libya
Mexico

16 Throughout focus groups, some participants arrived after the discussion had begun or left before it had concluded, making it difficult to establish the precise number of participants.
17 As noted in the Methods section, completion of the demographic survey, as with all aspects of participation in the focus group, was optional.
Approximately two-thirds of participants spoke some English or French. Participants also had 13 different mother tongues or first languages:

- Albanian
- Arabic
- English
- French
- Hungarian
- Kalanguya
- Karen
- Kiswahili
- Mandarin
- Somali
- Spanish
- Tagalog
- Urdu

Beyond these mother tongues, 13 additional languages are spoken, read, and/or written by participants in the focus groups:

- Bali
- Bicol
- Burmese
- Creole
- Greek
- Hindi
- Iloncano
- Nyounga
- Pampango
- Pangasinense
- Punjabi
- Sqhip
- Turkish

Amid all of this linguistic diversity, two-thirds (44) of participants spoke, read, or wrote some English.

Immigration statuses upon arrival:
- Refugee claimants: 20
- Convention refugees: 2
- Landed immigrants: 25
- Government Assisted Refugees: 7
- Other: 7 (including student, visitor, live-in caregiver, and others)

Half (33) of participants’ immigration statuses changed since arrival. Statuses changed most commonly to Landed Immigrant, Canadian Citizen, Convention Refugee, or Permanent Resident.
4.2 Focus Group Findings

This section summarizes findings from consultations with 9 communities of newcomers through 8 focus groups and individual interviews.

Participants indicated their preferred format of receiving information about services for newcomers, which were (in descending order):

1. In person
2. Print (often in own language)
3. Internet
4. Phone
5. Cultural media

Most participants prefer to receive information in person. Most participants also first received information about services in Hamilton in person, usually from family or friends. This finding further emphasizes the importance of personal contacts in learning about and connecting to available supports.

When asked why they chose Hamilton to live in over any other city in Canada, respondents offered the following reasons (in descending order):

1. Family, friends, community
2. Calm, quiet, and/or smaller than Toronto
3. Lower cost of living
4. Employment
5. Climate/geography
6. Chance
7. CIC/immigration decided

These responses further reinforce the importance of informal networks (family, friends, community, etc.) to newcomers not only in setting into Hamilton but also in deciding to come to this city in the first place. While some of these responses, such as chance and government immigration decisions, cannot be controlled locally, the remaining top five reasons for coming to Hamilton may be usefully mobilized as part of an immigrant attraction strategy.

Barriers

Many people do not know what services are available or are not comfortable navigating through the system. Common barriers to supports were:

1. Language: More interpretation is needed, especially for communicating with doctors, landlords, potential employers, and service providers. Interpretation is more important for some issues such as health.
2. Employment/credential recognition: Many people spoke about challenges having their credentials recognized and getting work in their field.
3. Health: This was often related to language. Newcomers sometimes do not get treatment because they do not have an interpreter. Health care has special language challenges.
5. Settlement and integration: immigration doctor; long wait for convention refugee status.
6. Housing: Also often related to language. Finding appropriate housing can be challenging, especially with a language barrier. Some spoke about unfair practices by landlords.
Supports

Informal networks (family, friends, religious institutions, etc.) provide many settlement supports already. Many participants would like to more resources directed at these supports.

Many participants identified case management or wrap-around service approaches as being particularly helpful. Specifically, participants spoke highly of agencies who assigned a social worker to help with paperwork, referrals, and appointments with lawyers, doctors, banks, housing, legal aid, food banks, interpretation, and schools/post-secondary education for children and adults, respectively. When supported by this type of service, participants described feeling that most types support or information they needed could be accessed through one agency or contact person. These services had the added benefit of the newcomer participant knowing who could be contacted for information or support. Such practices could usefully be emulated by other service providers where possible.

Many participants had supports from SISO with things like interpretation, housing, language training, health cards, referrals, and other services. SISO was a ‘one-stop shop,’ and many of the participants said they now find it confusing to find where to go for services. A smaller proportion of participants felt that current services were not at the level of services provided by SISO. It is not clear from focus group data whether this sense emerges from a preference for a ‘one-stop shop’ model, or from specific kinds of services not being offered in the current arrangement. The comment may also simply reflect that change in the system of services has taken place. What was made clear through the focus groups is that many newcomers felt comfortable accessing supports at SISO, oftentimes because staff members shared the ethno-cultural background or language of newcomer clients. Further, several participants suggested that newcomer communities could have better awareness and knowledge of services if mainstream agencies hired outreach workers from communities of newcomers they hope to serve. This reinforces the perceived benefits of having staff from newcomer communities within formal service organizations. Beyond this strategy, though, it underscores the crucial importance of all service providers and residents sharing in the responsibility to eliminate discrimination and create a welcoming community with newcomers. Making Hamilton a more welcoming community through public education is in fact a key part of the Hamilton Immigration Partnership Council’s work.

Supporting groups mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>211</th>
<th>Mohawk College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC)</td>
<td>Paralegal, legal aid, legal clinics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td>Religious institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment agencies</td>
<td>SACHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL schools</td>
<td>School boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family, friends, informal groups</td>
<td>SISO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food banks</td>
<td>St. Joseph’s Immigrant Women’s Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Shepherd</td>
<td>The Globe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Centre for Civic Inclusion (HCCI)</td>
<td>Urban Core Community Health Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Public Library</td>
<td>Volunteer Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inasmuch House</td>
<td>YMCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micah House</td>
<td>YWCA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these findings, participants also offered a wide range of responses to the question, “What would make the biggest difference to help you and your family settle in Hamilton?” These responses formed the basis of the draft recommendations presented at the focus group feedback session for verification and adjustment, and are outlined and discussed below.
4.3 Focus Group Feedback Session Findings

The summary above was presented to participants at the March 31st 2012 focus group participants’ feedback event, held at the YWCA Seniors Centre. Participants discussed these findings and draft recommendations and offered their feedback, particularly about what should be added to the summaries.

The following draft recommendations, emerging from focus group findings, were also presented into six themes for discussion and feedback:

**Language** - more interpretation is needed, especially for health issues; improve structure of English instruction.

**Coordination between services** - one stop shop, roundtable of agencies, common database.

**Connect informal and formal supports** - support capacity building of informal networks; support some religious institutions as settlement service providers; seek opportunities to problem solve and develop solutions together within communities; share information between formal and informal supports.

**Employment** - faster processing of work permits; volunteer opportunities to gain local experience while on Ontario Works to help find employment; language specific job banks, hiring hall.

**Good information** - to newcomers about the entire settlement process; to frontline staff about the entire settlement process, including legal status and documents.

**Better access to supports** - welcoming environment; personalized support, possibly including slower explanations in English when necessary; outreach workers; advocacy or accompaniment in referrals; non-weekday access; Ombudsman for accountability; map of Hamilton.

In response to the points outlined in the summary above, participants offered several additions and emphasized some existing points. Firstly, language barriers were again emphasized as crucial for many newcomers as they strive to settle in Hamilton. Participants discussed the need for more accessible interpretation, including opportunities to offer interpretation themselves, as well as the tremendous benefit of having information and brochures from service providers translated into other languages. Being able to receive information in one’s own language, either in print or verbally, makes services and information much more accessible and useful for many newcomers, even when English skills are present. Participants also suggested that some providers of interpretation service could improve management of post-traumatic stress disorders for people coming from war torn areas. Also related to language, some participants felt that some ESL instruction was too “laid back” and could be improved with more structure. Some participants also expressed a desire to keep their traditions while learning English, adding that support was needed to teach their language and culture to their children.

Some participants suggested that more than language, networking opportunities for newcomers are lacking. Opportunities for individuals who do not arrive in family groups to connect with communities should be created as much as possible.

Employment was another area of significant concern for participants. As discussed above, some participants described feeling discriminated against because of wearing a hijab when seeking employment. Participants also described the deep frustration that many newcomers feel when arriving in Canada with significant skills and credentials and still having trouble securing employment, particularly in their field. Participants discussed many supports that would be helpful in such employment related challenges, including resources for job hunting, seminars and workshops on practical skills such as resume writing, interview tips and marketing immigrant skills within the Canadian work force. Targeted supports for newcomer women were also recommended, including more access to driving lessons. Government wage subsidies for newcomers such as those available to youth were also recommended by participants. Most of these services are provided by employment service providers, but clearly there is a significant awareness gap between what is available and what newcomers are currently accessing. Many
participants also discussed the significant barrier to employment that is local employment experience. Several suggestions were made about how volunteer and apprenticeship opportunities could be increased and made more accessible in order to support newcomers connecting to employment and building local networks. Participants also discussed a need for clear information about the legal rights for workers with respect to their religion (having breaks for prayer and religious dress). Particular challenges and opportunities for older immigrants were also discussed. Specifically, older immigrants often have more experience to offer, but language is often more challenging to acquire, and volunteer and employment opportunities are limited. Employers were viewed as often not wanting to take a risk on hiring an older immigrant. Older workers often experience challenges in finding employment, and this may be compounded by experiences as a newcomer and/or language difficulties.

Government support for informal networks was also a priority for some participants. Specific examples offered of what such support could look like included both distributing translated printed information about services and possibly providing some services through local churches, mosques, ethnic markets, halls and other places where new immigrants most often congregate.

Health was another around which participants had suggestions. For communities who may prefer women doctors, it was recommended that a list of female family doctors be compiled and circulated among newcomer communities. Lower income was another challenge to sufficient health care, for some health benefits are not covered publicly, and some participants sought improved elder care. Some participants also commented that domestic challenges are sometimes present for newcomers and information and supports can be difficult to find.

Participants also described challenges of finding and waiting long periods of time for City Housing. Culturally appropriate foods served at book banks such as halal, vegetarian, non-pork, non-beef were also suggested.

Participants also recommended launching an educational campaign to promote immigrant contributions in shaping Canada, particularly Hamilton in terms of its economy, politics, and overall development was also mentioned. Such a campaign would aim to promote awareness and appreciation among all Hamiltonians that immigration is part and parcel of the country’s history and development, and to ease tensions among native-born and new immigrants about misconceptions on the latter (i.e., that newcomers are “out to get their jobs”).

More general comments about services were also offered. Participants suggested that scattered services by different agencies (or the lack of a one-stop shop) were more difficult for them to access. Some participants also proposed that understanding among some service providers of post-traumatic stress from for newcomers coming from war-torn regions could be improved. Overall, many participants described a lack of awareness about what services and supports are available to newcomers.

A prominent and crucial addition is the issue of discrimination. Participants shared experiences in which they felt they were discriminated against, and such experiences were common among participants, especially as a barrier to securing employment. For example, some participants perceived that some faith-based organizations would not hire people of another faith background. Others described experiences of discrimination when potential employers formed first impressions based on their race, accent, religious affiliation, or manner of dressing/appearance (particularly when wearing a hijab).

Some participants also pointed out that the term “informal networks” puts all non-government funded agencies that provide settlement services into one category, when in fact there are many organizations in with the “informal networks” category that are formally incorporated non-profit organizations with by-laws and boards of directors. In short, there is a spectrum of formality and informality among groups that offer supports of various kinds to newcomers.

Some participants were also concerned that tension arising from competition between agencies for funding was not addressed in the summary. For example, one participant described being told by a service provider that the service provider would not advertise or share information with clients about
another service out of a sense of that their’ clients ‘belonged’ to one agency. Some participants saw this as a challenge or a disincentive to deeper collaboration between service providers.

Some other participants also discussed difficulties experienced when trying to navigate through different services offered by many different agencies, and expressed a desire to have groups of service providers “sitting at one table” together to assess and act on how to best support a given newcomer based on individual circumstances. One participant suggested a database shared by agencies that would share clients’ information because, with the current system, “You have to start all over again when you are sent to another place.”

Quick Guide Feedback

Some participants requested that information be grouped by status-specific service seekers, such as visa students, live-in caregivers/temporary workers, refugees, landed immigrant, etc. Unfortunately, because the complexity of this task and the time available in which to complete the guide, this organization was not possible, though such targeted information guides could be considered in the future.

Some participants also felt that the colour coding used in the alphabetical list of services was not clear, and preferred that services be grouped by heading, such as “health,” instead. This change was incorporated into the final version of the Quick Guide.

Participants also requested that another category - community groups - be added, which would include churches, mosques, associations, and other non-profits.

Descriptions of some services were seen as incomplete and not reflective of all services available at a given location. Capturing the full range of services in a brief description is challenging, and so the guide still contains summary descriptions to give a general impression of the types of supports available. On the other hand, some participants commented that they were learning about some services for the first time, which was a positive outcome.

Many participants recommended that 211 be the first line of the guide because of the wide range of language support offered by the information and referral service. Several participants also emphasized the importance of having the guide translated into other languages so that it could be accessible to more newcomers. As planned, and in reflection of this suggestion, the Quick Guide is being translated into 10 languages (plus the original English): Arabic, Bengali, French, Hindi, Hungarian, Karen, Mandarin, Punjabi, Spanish, and Urdu.

Participants also emphasized the importance of listing services geared specifically to youth.

Distribution was another key issue for participants, who requested that organizations represented at the event receive copies in addition to mainstream agencies. Libraries, websites (of many organizations), and Inform Hamilton were also suggested as important parts of a distribution strategy.
4.4 Key Findings – Informal Service Provider Consultations

- Many newcomers do not have clear and comprehensive information about the range of services available in Hamilton. This is a common and fundamental challenge.
- Hailing from 22 countries and speaking 26 languages, two-thirds of newcomers consulted had some English language skills.
- Language is a tremendous barrier experienced by newcomers in many aspects of life, including health, employment, and housing. Many challenges in each of these areas are inter-related.
- Despite high levels of English capability among newcomers to Hamilton and strong desire to improve language skills, greater access to interpretation and print information in multiple languages could help to overcome language barriers.
- Most newcomer participants preferred to receive information about services in person. Printed information in newcomer participants’ own language was the second most popular format, followed by the internet.
- Most newcomers consulted came to Hamilton because of family and friends, though lower living costs and greater quiet compared with Toronto also contributed to selecting Hamilton.
- Newcomers come to Hamilton for a variety of reasons, many of which could be promoted as part of an immigrant attraction strategy.
- Newcomers recommend more supports for informal networks, including information available in multiple languages where newcomers gather, and possibly newcomer services available at such locations.
5.0 DISCUSSION

From the many discussions outlined in previous sections, seven themes emerge as being particularly significant because of their prevalence and/or implications. These are discussed below.

Awareness is the biggest gap

Hamilton’s system of services for newcomers offers many resources and supports, but clearly many people in our community lack a clear understanding of where these supports are available and how to access them. For example, participants in the focus groups held with newcomers offered many recommendations about services that could help to address some of the challenges they faced. Later, in collating results from the focus groups, project staff found that most of the services and supports that had been recommended by focus group participants are already available in our community. This demonstrates a clear and unfortunately common experience for newcomers; not having accessible information about available services. Beyond this specific expression of a lack of awareness, discussions revealed a more general lack of knowledge among some newcomers of what services exist. Newcomers experiencing multiple barriers often do not know how to begin navigating the system of services that is available.

Service providers also need more and better information about available services in order to confidently refer newcomer clients. As highlighted in section 3.2, most service providers see newcomer clients who need referrals, but more than half of service providers do not feel they can easily access necessary information to confidently make necessary referrals. This may be partly a function of service providers having access to information that they are not certain is up to date or accurate given the reorganization of services locally. The newly enhanced website www.welcometohamilton.ca, an output from Community Information Hamilton as part of the Strengthening Newcomer Services project, offers an information tool to begin to fill this gap in knowledge.

Newcomers go to informal networks first

A message confirmed at every phase of this project was that newcomers tend to go to informal networks, including family, friends, religious institutions, and ethno-cultural groups, for information and support when first arriving in Hamilton. Literature on settlement and integration also confirms this finding, and it was also reflected in consultations with service providers and newcomers through this project. Often these connections are made because of common language or cultural understanding. Informal networks often offer support in helping to navigate the settlement service system to the extent possible, but of course time and resources with which to offer such support are limited. Because newcomers typically go to informal networks for support it is crucial that people offering support through informal networks have good information about services and how to access them in order to bridge the gap between formal and informal services. Because capacity of informal networks is limited and demand for support is great, efforts to support capacity development of informal networks is an important way to improve outcomes for newcomers.

Information format preferences vary

Since awareness is the biggest gap within the system of services for newcomers, making information available in formats that are relevant and accessible to newcomers and service providers is an important consideration. When information format preferences were investigated, most newcomers indicated that they prefer to receive information (in descending order of prevalence) in-person, printed in their own language, and through the internet. Service providers usually went to the internet for information about services and referrals, or to other service providers. This highlights the importance of both up to date and easily accessible information about services online and networking between frontline service providers. Taken together, findings from consulting these two groups of stakeholders suggests that a variety of information tools are needed in order to effectively address the gap in awareness identified through this project. A one size (or method) fits all approach simply will not work.
Language is the greatest barrier

Clearly language is a crucial barrier to newcomers’ full integration in Hamilton. This issue was most commonly linked to issues of health and health care, but also frequently to employment and housing. Although many newcomers have some English or French language skills when arriving, some issues such as health were seen as requiring interpretation more urgently than in other situations. Services to newcomers are available in a large number of languages, but of course not all services are offered in every language. Anecdotally, several stories were shared through this project of newcomers accessing a given service because of the ability of a staff person to communicate in the client’s mother tongue although the service offered may not be able to meet the client’s needs. In such situations, clients may be referred to other agencies who offer services that address the clients’ needs but may not have staff who speak the client’s mother tongue, often leading newcomer clients to return to an agency whose mandate does not fit their needs simply because of language. This is a significant and very real barrier to newcomers accessing needed services.

Discrimination is a common experience among newcomers

Many newcomers described experiences of discrimination, particularly in terms of employment and housing. For example, focus group participants described being turned down in trying to access housing because of having a social insurance number beginning with 9, which are social insurance numbers issued to temporary workers who are neither Canadian citizens nor permanent residents. Other participants described experiences of discrimination in employment due to religious dress. Certainly discrimination is a long standing issue around the world, and progress has been made in making Canadian society more inclusive, but these recent and troubling experiences show that more work needs to be done. Training in inclusion and anti-discrimination practices can help bring our community closer to being a truly inclusive one.

Formal service providers are collaborating through HIPC

At the initial public gathering of Strengthening Newcomer Services in June 2011, service providers clearly stated that they do not have appetite to create another collaborative body around newcomer services. Instead, there was a strong desire to work within the framework of the Hamilton Immigration Partnership Council (HIPC) and strengthen collaboration through that body. Responding to this clear message, the Strengthening Newcomer Services project continued to stay connected with HIPC throughout the project, with several members sitting on HIPC’s steering committee, and the project itself becoming a working group of HIPC. Indeed, the collaboration taking place amongst service providers through the many HIPC working groups has produced or is in the process of producing sector-specific information guides for newcomers and service providers.

Some newcomers find the lack of one-stop shop confusing

After SISO’s closure key programs were reallocated to other service providers, but many newcomers described finding the lack of a ‘one-stop shop’ model as confusing and did not have clear understandings of which services were being offered by which agencies, who was eligible, or even what services existed in the community. The lack of awareness discussed above is a predictable outcome of the reorganization of services. Given this confusion, the many service providers who offer supports to newcomers can help improve outcomes for newcomers not by merging into a one-stop shop, but by thinking, planning, and delivering services as a system so that newcomers’ experiences of referrals between agencies are coordinated and smooth. In fact, the HIPC’s focus has been on facilitating the collaboration among service providers and the coordination of services. This makes communication between agencies, particularly frontline workers offering support to newcomers, all the more valuable.
Another element of having services delivered by many agencies which generated concern among some newcomer participants in this project is the issue of competition for funding between agencies. As discussed in the focus group findings section, one participant encountered a service provider who was reluctant even to share information about other services, let alone refer clients to the other service. With reduced funding from government for settlement services and many agencies seeking funding, tension often exists between agencies, presenting a systemic disincentive to deeper collaboration.
6.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section outlines the outcomes, recommendations, and conclusions emerging from this initiative.

6.1 Outcomes

As outlined in section 1.3 Deliverables, the project set out to accomplish a number of specific tasks. These are repeated here and accompanied by a brief summary of the accomplishments associated with each deliverable.

- Deliverable: Improved information and data on the system of services for immigrants and newcomers in Hamilton

Outcome: Community Information Hamilton (CIH)’s work as part of this initiative improved information on the system of services to newcomers, created in partnership with the HIPC, by ensuring that records in CIH’s approximately 4,500 record database pertaining to programs, services and organizations within Hamilton’s settlement sector were updated and contained accurate and relevant information. CIH also reshaped the information contained in the records to ensure that each record:

- Displayed information in an easily accessible and intuitive manner
- Displayed information relevant to recent immigrants and newcomers
- Provided users with options pertaining to the degree of maneuverability
- Clearly display the number and types of languages that the service is provided in
- Add an eligibility section to each applicable record, indicating the eligibility criteria for programs and services based on immigrant class or category
- Reformat specified records to ensure that accessing one record will ease access to similar records

The database is now more accessible and serves a stronger role in maneuvering Hamilton’s settlement sector. The entire database including each record can be translated via a Google Translate function. This function allows recent immigrant users to view the information in a variety of languages, as offered by Google. Further, the crucial eligibility information is pertinent for their successful navigation of the settlement sector and their settlement experience as a whole.

- Deliverable: Updated information on the new system of settlement services in Hamilton

Outcome: Along with significant changes to the existing database and records, CIH undertook a creative and multidisciplinary process of mobilizing resources to create an interactive web based application for recent immigrants, newcomers, and service providers alike. This web based application is hosted on the internet and appears to the user in the form of a web site. This web based application can be reached at: www.welcometohamilton.ca.

The purpose of this web site is to provide access to specific records, relevant for newcomer’s immediate settlement and long term integration in Canada. This specialized application channels access to CIH’s approximately 4,500 records and contains the following features:

- A set of eight (8) lists containing various categories of services and programs for newcomer clients
- A simple domain which assists newcomers in searching for program, service or organization specific information
- A page devoted to available community tools and resources which can be downloaded and printed by recent immigrants or their settlement service providers
- The web based application is designed to be dynamic and contains various technical features which allow the lists, records, information and content of the web site to be reformatted, adjusted and revised accordingly
The lists are adjustable and can be customized according to the needs of the user and those providing information. Most importantly, the online tools page provides access to resources and guides such as a) the Employment Services Guide, b) Settlement Services Quick Guide, c) Settlement Services for Service Providers and more. This website also displays information in a very clear manner using font sizes and styles which are convenient for users with visual impairment. All of these factors contribute to making this web based application a convenient tool which can be navigated quickly to find information about programs, services, and organizations.

- Deliverable: Quick reference guides, in several languages, as a quick reference for newcomers and service providers

Outcome: Quick Guides of information about newcomer services have been produced in English, and are in translation into 10 other languages. These will be available at www.welcometohamilton.ca and will be distributed in limited quantities throughout the community. Community Information Hamilton now takes on stewardship of these guides and any future changes to them.

- Deliverable: Increased awareness of community services responding to immigrant and newcomer populations

Outcome: With several hundred community members engaged through this initiative, including government, service providers, and newcomers, and combined with the hard work of HIPC and its working groups, there is certainly increased awareness of community services responding to newcomer populations. As discussed earlier, however, awareness remains the most significant gap and requires further action to address the issue fully.

- Deliverable: Two large community events to engage community around improving services to newcomers

Outcome: The project hosted four larger community events rather than the planned two. (See section 2.0 Methods for a description of each of the four events. See Appendix 1 for summaries of evaluations of all events.)

- Deliverable: Focus group discussions to increase participation and enhance understandings of integration and coordination efforts

Outcome: Focus group consultations were held with 9 communities of newcomers seeking input and experiences from newcomers of services in Hamilton.

- Deliverable: Improved formal and informal network relationships among groups, agencies and services providing support to newcomers

Outcome: Formal and informal network representatives were brought together in the wrap-up event on May 31st to learn about one another’s supports and build relationships. Although over 100 people attended the event, fewer representatives from newcomer communities were present. The need for bridging the gaps between these two important forms of support for newcomers has been highlighted clearly through this project.

- Deliverable: A report on activities and findings in assessing knowledge, awareness, relationships, experiences, and needs in newcomer services in Hamilton

- Deliverable: Recommendations for change that will support efforts to strengthen the local system of services supporting newcomers

Outcome: This report meets these two deliverables.
6.2 Unanticipated outcomes

Any community-based undertaking generates not only the intended outcomes of the project but also some unanticipated outcomes. Two unanticipated outcomes from this initiative are:

- From the perspective of the former HIPC Program Manager, the HIPC working groups have been influenced to work more cross-sectorally.
- Partners in this project, specifically the HIPC and SPRC, helped facilitate dialogue between CIH and the City Manager’s Office, where the Immigration Portal is housed, which lead to the successful funding application to the provincial Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration to enhance and promote the portal website for newcomers.

6.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings from consultations with service providers and newcomers, this report makes the following recommendations, discussed under the seven themes identified in the Discussion section (5.0).

1. **Awareness is the biggest gap**

   - Increase networking opportunities for newcomers, both within newcomer communities and between newcomer communities and more established local communities.

   - The HIPC service provider working groups should continue to convene networking opportunities for service providers, possibly by committing to organizing the Downtown Brown Bag Lunch series in a sustainable way.

Opportunities for service provider networking are already happening in our community, such as through the Downtown Brown Bag Lunch series. To date, this initiative has been organized on a volunteer basis. While such volunteer commitments are commendable, sustaining such valuable opportunities requires formal commitment from one or more organizations. This provides greater likelihood of the initiative continuing through staff changes, and gives the broader community a clear sense of where and how to seek more information about the initiative.

The Strengthening Newcomers Services events allowed service providers to exchange information and basic agency contact information, but more opportunities to network and share information about particular services, eligibility requirements and contact information could help to bridge the knowledge gaps identified by service providers, particularly in terms of confidently making referrals. HIPC should convene at least once annually a marketplace event that brings service providers and informal cultural support groups together to share information, build networks and relationships, develop strategies for improving local service system capacity for support to newcomers.

   - Service providers should employ culturally competent outreach workers whenever possible to provide advocacy or accompaniment in referrals to newcomers, and to connect newcomers to existing services.

   - Government and service providers should explore opportunities to distribute printed information for new immigrant settlement, integration, and access to services in Hamilton in religious institutions, ethnic markets, halls and other places where newcomers often gather.

   - Offer a map of Hamilton to newcomers to support faster familiarity with the city. Explore potential partnerships with Tourism Hamilton to facilitate distribution of existing maps.
2. Newcomers go to informal networks first
   - Support the capacity building work of HCCI with informal networks in order to build broader awareness of formal services available and strengthen connections between formal and informal networks.
   - Service providers should consider holding events and service hours outside of weekdays in order to reach community members with conflicting time demands.
   - Recognize and support informal networks, including some religious institutions, as settlement service providers along a continuum of formality of service.

3. Information format preferences vary
   - Continue to resource the existing Community Information Hamilton (CIH) database tools as these provide the information and referral possibilities for individuals and service providers. More resources would allow CIH to develop the tools and coordinate the services network using the already well-developed comprehensive database.
   - Develop and distribute clearly written papers about the legal rights for workers with respect to their religion (e.g. having breaks for prayer) and attire.
   - Make available a list of female family doctors and other health care providers.

4. Language is the greatest barrier
   Focus group findings exposed stories of people enduring, deteriorating, and irreversible conditions.
   - Improve access to interpreters for health care appointments and immigration-related medical examinations.
   - Provide translated information brochures and contact information in multiple languages as part of good practice.
   - Explore the possibility of sharing language interpretation skills of staff members between agencies.
   - HIPC and its community partners should research and propose a standard of service for access to interpretation in Hamilton to support ongoing monitoring and improvement in such access.
   - Explore models of coordinated volunteer interpretation, including infrastructure and incentives for newcomer volunteers such as training and development opportunities, certificates, local experience, and local references.

5. Discrimination is a common experience among newcomers
   - Continue implementing the HIPC’s systematic approach of asking all employers, institutions, and individual community members to commit to the principle that every person at every level has a responsibility to work towards supporting newcomer integration.
□ Strengthen HCCI’s role as ombudsman for newcomers.

□ Anti-discrimination or anti-oppression training should be undertaken wherever possible in service providing organizations along the formal and informal continuum. This could be one aspect of the professional development already set out in HIPC’s current work plan.

□ Provide training to frontline staff in working with newcomers specifically to deepen understandings of post-traumatic stress disorder for newcomers arriving from conflict zones.

□ Support an educational campaign to promote immigrant contributions to Hamilton’s growth and prosperity.

6. **Formal service providers are collaborating through HIPC**

Through HIPC’s steering committee and working groups, collaboration among organizations providing services to newcomers is growing. The following recommendations are offered as considerations for formal service providers through their membership in HIPC.

□ Develop a process by which agencies can share information about program proposals to ensure that duplication does not occur and facilitate constructive conversations to strengthen service proposals.

□ Explore the potential benefits and drawbacks of developing a common referral form to be used for making referrals between service providers.

□ Consider opportunities and processes for sharing staff members’ language skills across agencies.

□ Seek opportunities to problem solve and develop solutions together within communities.

7. **Some newcomers find the lack of one-stop shop confusing**

□ Develop indicators to monitor impact of system in supporting newcomers and annually conduct an evaluation documenting the results of the support system.

In addition to this recommendation, recommendations under themes 1 and 6 could also help to make the current system of services for newcomers clearer and easier to understand.
APPENDIX A – EVENT EVALUATIONS

A) Strengthening Newcomer Services - Introductory Event
June 29, 2011 - LIUNA Station
Evaluation Summary

Total evaluations: 25 (missing 6 evaluations, not including the 7 organizing partners)

Q1. How would you rate this session?

Poor: 1       Average: 3       Above Average: 17       Excellent: 4

Average of ratings: 3.84

Q2. Themes of what attendees found useful:

- Networking opportunities
- Specific discussion formats, small group session particularly
- Hearing more about this collaborative effort to do something useful for newcomers; understanding the steps being taken as part of this project; strong objectives; a clear agenda; well planned; great presentation by Inform Hamilton.

Q3. Themes of what did not work well in this meeting and suggested changes for future events.

- Calls for aligning with HIPC; “Should have talked about the Hamilton Immigration Strategy”; “more input required ahead of time from HIPC”
- Other suggested changes: having handouts; more group discussion; more interactive; more networking; less Q&A; more precision and concrete action plan important for next meeting
- Criticisms: “duplication of work & services already underway”; the last exercise (small groups); noisy air conditioning
- Participants/groups missing, e.g./ newcomers, informal networks, “members from ethnic communities,” Wesley Urban Ministries

Q4. Other comments:

- Mostly positive (9)
- “Not all key stakeholders attended”
- “Organizing committee needs to determine if this is a strategic group or an operations group”
- “Focus on collaboration within agencies. Always refer French clients to French agencies.”
- “Keep to 2 goals/objectives; move afterwards to gap analysis-case”
• “Please develop action plan (objective/how/when) to eventually move from grassroots providers to a large organized approach to collect & engage informal newcomers”
• “Tie to IPCS”

Q5. Preferred ways of receiving information:

**Email:** 16
**Electronic 4 pg. Summaries:** 18
Hard Copy 4 pg. Summaries: 4
**Electronic 1 pg. Executive Summaries:** 9
Hard Copy 1 pg. Executive Summaries: 3
Blog: 2
Other: 0
B) Strengthening Newcomer Services Marketplace Event  
October 21, 2011 - The Scottish Rite  
Evaluation Summary

Total responses: 113

- Range of sectors represented
- Most respondents got the information they were looking for

Looking for but didn’t find:
- Statistics of numbers of immigrants and refugees in Hamilton
- Looking for coordination services
- More information, i.e. guest speaker on employment services specific for newcomers i.e. eligibility for programs, etc., in depth info
- More about transfer services from SISO
- Housing help centre
- I still don’t know how are we going to strengthen newcomer services. Options for newcomer services become very limited and not marketed enough.
- Who is serving refugee claimants? I still have this question
- Would have liked to see child care subsidy here
- Needed more specific information on services. Booths were a good idea, but need people to talk about their services and not just there at booths to answer questions.
- It was good. I found everything I was looking for.
- Differences/definitions of four categories of newcomers

**Average scores** (on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being “not at all satisfied” and 5 being “very satisfied”)

Location : 4.2 (satisfied)
Information/Handouts: 4.45 (satisfied)
Presentations/Speakers: 4.19 (satisfied)
Overall organization of event:4.42  (satisfied)
How useful was today’s event?: 4.27(satisfied)
Opportunities to network? 4.12(satisfied)
Effective presentation/communication of information? 4.05(satisfied)
Likely to attend similar events in the future? 4.57(satisfied)

Most common ways of finding out about event:
1. email brochure
2. community networks
3. other
4. word of mouth
5. website
Recurring feedback:
- Opportunity for face-to-face networking was very valuable, could be repeated regularly
- Location somewhat cramped
- Would like more time for networking, viewing displays
- Seeking more specific information about services, eligibility, demographic changes
- Would like to see newcomers themselves at event; questions clearly by non-immigrants
C) Strengthening Newcomer Services Newcomer Town Hall Event
March 31st, 2012 – YWCA Seniors Centre
Evaluation Summary

• 43 Participants
• 27 Evaluations

Averages (Scale 1 to 4)

How much did you like:
  a) This event? 3.9
  b) The information presented? 3.7
  c) The food? 3.6
  d) The location? 3.8
  e) The time of day? 3.8

Quick Guide Evaluation

31 Evaluations

Averages (Scale of 1 to 4, with 1 being not useful at all and 4 being very useful):

1) How useful do you think the quick guide will be for you and other newcomers? 3.4
2) How much do you like the quick guide? 3.2
3) Is there anything that you didn’t understand in the quick guides?

Several respondents required the guide in their mother tongue. Some respondents felt that the guide was incomplete.

4) Is there any information missing from the quick guide?

Respondents suggested that 211 be listed at the beginning of the guide. Several people also recommended that the guides be available at religious institutions throughout the community, as this is where newcomers often go for information when they arrive in Hamilton. Further, many respondents asked that information about religious institutions and other less formal newcomer serving organizations should be included in the guide. Some respondents asked that eligibility information be included. Another suggested that entries in the guide use an alphabetical list of services rather than agencies.
Total Responses: 28

1. Which service sector do you represent?

- Other – 14 (Women’s services, settlement/immigration, Housing/homelessness, Hamilton downtown Mosque x2, Resident engagement and planning, Welcoming Communities, Social services/counselling, Community Dev., looking for info, Grass Roots org.)
- Settlement - 6
- Housing - 2
- Education/Training -2
- Employment -2
- Healthcare -2

2. Did you get the information you were looking for today?

Yes – 27
No – 0
Somewhat – 1

a. If no, what kind of information were you looking for that you did not find?

- If I can do any help to newcomers.
- I was not exactly sure what to expect, but left with lots of good information.
- Development ideas and changes wanted
- More details about report
- But it could be better if Grass Root org could be encouraged to be part of it, other than ours.

3. How would you rate your satisfaction with the following items?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Not at all Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Handouts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations/Speakers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall organization of event</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Constructive criticism: email poster we received was not clear enough to me. I thought possibly it was open to public, made a difference on how many
handouts to bring. Not sure if we had to do a presentation. Did not know covered tables were provided.

- Who are the target groups here?
- Community members, actual newcomers need this info more than service providers.
- I wasn't aware of all these services available in Hamilton. Great for networking.
- We need to be more connected/work together.
- Food was delicious
- Carla did an excellent job at presenting an overview of the findings, Lots of handouts available. The convention centre was fine - but not the best location for attracting newcomers. The food was excellent and appreciated.
- Late in the day a real challenge
- Thank You
- Outreach to more people in the immigrant community and their grass root organizations and networks.

4. **How did you find out about this event?**

   *Email Brochure – 14*
   *Community Network – 7*
   *Other – 5 (work, HCCI, SPRC, SPO advised, HIPC, attended previously)*
   *Word of mouth – 4*
   *Website – 0*

5. **Overall, how useful did you find today’s event for strengthening newcomer services?**

   Not at All Useful | Not Very Useful | Neutral | Useful | Very Useful
---|---|---|---|---|
0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 11

Comments:
- Keep it up and plan to reach the larger minorities who desperately need to access the service.
- Look forward to seeing the strategies and recommendations being implemented.
- Great to hear about the results of the research and to see the Quick Guide and website.
- Community problems brought to our attention.
- Increase awareness needed and community engagement - outreach to [unclear] network.

6. **Overall, how effective was the event at providing you with an opportunity to exchange ideas and network?**

   Not at All Effective | Not Very Effective | Neutral | Effective | Very Effective
---|---|---|---|---|
0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 9
Comments:
- Next time, make it on a Saturday for others to come.
- It will be good if there is some kind of training regarding ways of phasing between organizations. There has been sweet/sour relationships that don't allow partnership.
- Had some helpful conversations with other service providers

7. Overall, how effectively was the information presented/communicated?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at All Effective</th>
<th>Not Very Effective</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please rate how likely you are to attend a similar or other event on connecting with newcomer services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at All Likely</th>
<th>Not Very Likely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any additional comments?
- For me, use of acronym was a mystery - I did not know most of them or know what it meant.
- Try to reach the hard to reach majority of the population you want to serve.
- Well organized
- Thanks for providing this opportunity to connect with community, it's so important!!
- I was expecting more newcomers to come and not primarily service providers. It was not entirely clear who the audience was.
APPENDIX B – MAP OF SETTLEMENT PATTERNS OF RECENT IMMIGRANTS IN HAMILTON, 2006

Generalized settlement pattern of recent immigrants (2001-2006) living in the urban areas of the city of Hamilton, 2006
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Data sources: 2006 Census, Statistics Canada; City of Hamilton Map produced by the Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton (November 2011) with financial support from the Ontario Trillium Foundation.