



Faith & Settlement Partnerships: Setting Immigrants & Canada up for Success

Case Study Report: The Salvation Army
May 2017

Dr. James Cresswell & Giovanna Heron

Faith and Settlement Partnerships: Setting Immigrants and Canada up for Success is a research partnership intended to explore partnerships between faith-based and government-funded settlement organizations in Ontario. This two-year project is led by the Centre for Community Based Research (CCBR) and funded by the **Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC)**. More information can be found at:

[www.communitybasedresearch.ca/Page/View/Faith & Settlement Partnerships](http://www.communitybasedresearch.ca/Page/View/Faith%20&%20Settlement%20Partnerships)

The project used multiple methods. Case studies were held within the local study sites. Other methods included a literature review and a cross-site organizational survey. Reports were written for each method.

Research Partnership

Rich Janzen	Centre for Community Based Research
Joanna Ochocka	Centre for Community Based Research
Kyla English	Centre for Community Based Research
Chris Brnjas	Centre for Community Based Research
Jim Cresswell	Ambrose University
Ron Kuipers	Institute for Christian Studies
Hector Acero Ferrer	Institute for Christian Studies
Michael Skaljin	Interfaith Council of Peel
Huda Hussein	London & Middlesex Local Immigration Partnership
Mohammed Baobaid	Muslim Resource Centre for Social Support and Integration
Elyas Farooqi	Muslim Resource Centre for Social Support and Integration
Aamna Ashraf	Peel Newcomer Strategy Group
Trisha Scantlebury	Peel Newcomer Strategy Group
Idrisa Pandit	Renison University College
Doug Binner	The Salvation Army
Victoria Esses	The University of Western Ontario
Vera Dodic	Toronto Newcomer Office
Mark Chapman	Tyndale University College and Seminary
Giovanna Heron	Tyndale University College and Seminary
Tara Bedard	Waterloo Region Immigration Partnership
Sarah Best	Wilfrid Laurier University
Ida Kaastra-Mutoigo	World Renew
Cameron Klapwyk	World Renew

Site Team – The Salvation Army: Toronto, Kitchener-Waterloo, & London

Authors

Dr. James Cresswell, Associate Professor,
Ambrose University & Booth University College

Giovanna Heron, Research Assistant, Tyndale
University College and Seminary

Advisory Panel

Major Corinne Cameron, Executive Director, Parent Child Resource Centre
Major Glenda Davis, Area Commander, The Salvation Army
Captain Angelica Hernandez, Executive Director, Immigration & Refugee
Services
Paula Marshall, Immigration Liaison, The Salvation Army Territorial
Headquarters
Sergio Moncaleano, Multicultural Ministry Coordinator, Mississauga
Temple
Peter Thomas, Community & Family Services Consultant, The Salvation
Army Territorial Headquarters



Centre for Community Based Research (CCBR)
190 Westmount Road North, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G5
Phone: 519-885-1460 ext. 25293

E-mail: rich@communitybasedresearch.ca
Website: www.communitybasedresearch.ca

Table of Contents

Context.....	3
A few words on immigration in The Salvation Army	3
Faith & Settlement partnerships in Kitchener/Waterloo, London, & Toronto.....	3
Methodology.....	4
Overall Findings/Executive Summary	9
Vision: To what extent are faith/settlement partnerships viewed positively?	10
1.1 What are the perceived opportunities for partnership?	10
1.2 What are the perceived pitfalls for partnership?	14
1.3 What underlying motivations, values and aspirations inform these opinions?	19
1.4 How and to what extent can differences in motivation/values/aspiration be navigated within policy and practice?	22
Structure: What types of partnerships presently exist and how could they be improved?.....	26
2.1 What benefits and challenges have emerged as a result of partnership activities?	26
2.2 What types of partnership activities seem particularly promising?	28
2.3 What service gaps could faith/settlement partnerships be most effective in addressing? ...	31
Process: How can effective partnerships be better facilitated?	34
3.1 What roles could faith and settlement leaders each play in partnership building?.....	34
3.2 How could collaborative program planning and policy development be encouraged?	37
3.3 What training and professional development activities could be developed or shared?	40
3.4 How could partnerships that support immigrants of faith be best evaluated?	42
Conclusions	44
References	45
Appendix A: Interview Guide	46

Context

A few words on immigration in The Salvation Army

As noted by Street (2002, pp. 21-32), mission is an essential feature of The Salvation Army (TSA). Broadly speaking, the mission of TSA is to spread hope, justice, and mercy as expressed in the phrase “heart to God and hand to man” (ibid., p. 25). This mission is an expression of the practical theology found in the Wesleyan tradition; a tradition that advocates responding to God’s grace by finding concrete ways of enabling the flourishing of justice and love in a milieu (e.g. Maddox, 1994, p. 53). This ethos of finding concrete ways to help others has enabled TSA to become one of the largest international charitable organizations. It is a wide-ranging organization engaged in various kinds of humanitarian efforts all over the world. Much of its work involves assisting those who are in need.

The TSA has been working with immigrants to Canada since the early 1900’s (Moyles, 2017). It was instrumental in establishing an immigration process aimed at enabling Britons to migrate to Canada and offered settlement services to these newcomers. This work was a collaborative effort where TSA worked closely with the Canadian and British governments (Langfield, 2004). Currently, the TSA supports immigration to Canada by aiding refugees coming under private sponsorship agreements. It provides liaisons that can assist and support churches in their efforts, and offers Immigrant and Refugee Services in some centres. Much of the work that TSA staff do with immigrants happens along-side services provided to those in economic distress or need. Food banks and low-cost thrift stores, for example, are services accessed by newcomers that tend to be in lower income brackets.

Faith & Settlement partnerships in Kitchener/Waterloo, London, & Toronto

The *Faith and Settlement Partnerships: Setting Immigrants and Canada up for Success* is a two-year research project funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC). Its purpose is to collaboratively study partnerships among faith-based and government-funded

settlement organizations in four sites in Ontario: Toronto, Peel, Waterloo, and London. This is being done to determine how these partnerships can better lead to positive settlement outcomes for newcomers, and ultimately benefit Canadian society.

This report is intended to provide an opportunity to better understand the unique role that TSA plays in a promising faith and settlement partnership within Ontario. This report illuminates the specific work that TSA is doing within the partnership, how this partnership – and other similar partnerships in Ontario – could be better facilitated, and to what extent such partnerships are viewed positively by others in the community. To accomplish this, a case study was conducted at various parts of the TSA in Kitchener/Waterloo, London, and Toronto. It includes information gathered from a range of people working at various levels of the organization in these cities.

Methodology

The case study realizes the project's general objectives:

1. To conduct a series of research projects that empirically explore ways in which faith-based and settlement organizations currently collaborate, and could better collaborate, to improve settlement outcomes of newcomers to the benefit of Canadian society (insight)
2. To pursue a series of knowledge mobilization activities that will inform effective faith/settlement partnerships within policy and practice (connection)
3. To develop a network of researchers (including students and emerging scholars) as well as faith and settlement leaders that will maximize their synergy in promoting effective faith/settlement partnerships (partnership development)

Consistent with the framework's three dimensions, this case study's main research questions are:

1. To what extent is the idea of faith/settlement partnerships being embraced? (vision)
2. What types of partnerships presently exist and how could they be improved? (structures)
3. How can effective partnerships be better facilitated? (processes)

Sampling & Participant Recruitment

To address the main research questions, interviews were conducted with workers from local TSA ministry units in Toronto, Kitchener/Waterloo, and London. An advisory panel composed of six members from TSA was formed to assist with the project. This panel is composed of people that work with newcomers in the areas where the study took place. The advisory panel acts as a sounding board and check-and-balance to make sure that a plurality of voices receive recognition (e.g., TSA, newcomers, front-line workers). The panel: (1) reviews the research methods and instruments, (2) assists with the recruitment of participants, (3) reviews the data and any reports, and (4) helps disseminate information. Members of the advisory panel were also eligible to be participants in the research.

The case study was intended to explore the general research questions and not concern itself with exhausting all avenues of information. As such, the plan for the case study was to interview up to 20 participants, who could act as Key Informants (KIs). The advisory panel identified ministry units that fit the scope of this research project. Within ministry units, the advisory panel identified people at each location that are centrally involved in dealing with newcomers. Representatives from TSA contacted the supervisors of potential KIs and secured permission for James Cresswell to directly contact potential participants. This ensured that direct superiors were not approaching potential participants, which protected the latter's confidentiality. Direct superiors provided several potential interview participants, but they did not have access to which participants were part of the study. Participation was directed

and managed by James Cresswell and not by direct superiors. Efforts were made to obtain a cross-section of gender, diversity, and ministry units. The result were 14 interviews with KIs from various areas of TSA and various levels within the organization (other details are withheld to protect confidentiality). Informed consent was obtained according to Tri-council guidelines for research with human subjects. The project was reviewed and approved by Booth University College's Research Ethics Review Board.

Interviews

The main questions in the body of the interview were derived from the research questions outlined in the project application to SSHRC. The advisory panel reviewed the interview guide and modified it to better match TSA context and the needs of TSA. The main body of the interview consisted of asking participants a series of open-ended qualitative questions that can be found at the end of the survey. The questions were read to the participants. The final interview guide is in Appendix A. The interviews were audio-recorded and conducted by James Cresswell in person (at a place and time of the KIs convenience) or over the phone.

Analysis

Mikhail Bakhtin (1986) is a significant figure in the human sciences and he left a series of notes entitled *Toward a Methodology in the Human Sciences* where he was working towards interpretive techniques for understanding human life. He writes that the task of interpreting human action is a hermeneutic one and not a natural-scientific one, which means that researchers interpret and do not just repeat what was found. He points out that the systemic approach to human action is possible and that such an approach would not be subject to the flaws of treating humans as natural things like rocks and trees. This approach is marked by his claim that the interpretation of human life should not fall into the reductionism of human sciences because the whole of communal action cannot be analytically

reduced to component parts. He argued that the subject matter in the case of interpreting human action is not thing-like in the way that a component of a machine must be. For within the natural-scientific mode

there is only a *voiceless thing*. Any object of knowledge (including man) can be perceived and cognized as a thing. But a subject as such cannot be perceived and studied as a thing, for as a subject it cannot, while remaining a subject, become voiceless, and, consequently, cognition of it can only be *dialogic*... The activity of one who acknowledges a voiceless thing and the activity of one who acknowledges another subject, that is, the *dialogic* activity of the acknowledger. (1986, p. 161, original emphasis; see also p. 159)

We cannot interpret human action as a thing-like component because it “speaks” – it contributes to the whole rather than acting as a component of the machine that can be easily replaced when broken. The vision that Bakhtin had of interpretive work in the human sciences is one that avoids reductionism by recognizing the active quality of the individual considering the whole of communal action.

What Bakhtin reveals is that the goal of a researcher, in a report like this, is two-fold. First, it involves interpreting the interviews and this means that the expertise and knowledge of the researcher is involved. Interpreting interviews involves putting together a coherent articulation of what a researcher sees. Second, even though the research report is the fruit of interpretation, the voices of the KIs are not lost and their words are used whenever possible. In the research report, quotations are left close to how they were said in the interviews, except for times where identifying information was removed or when sections had to be removed for the sake of brevity or focus. Moreover, the descriptions of their claims are put in the active present tense whenever possible. The research report is an expression of what is interpreted and what is expressed by the KIs. The goal is to produce a coherent piece that introduces new ideas and remains faithful to the ideas expressed by the KIs.

This background sets the stage for the actual work of coding. To interpret the transcripts, a two-step process was used. The first step involved the use of content analysis (see Neuman, 1997), which involved reading a transcript and coding it according to pre-defined categories. The pre-defined categories, in this case, were the research questions that make up the headings and sub-headings in the report. Within each category, constructivist grounded theory was used to interpret what the KIs claimed (see Charmaz, 2006). This practice of coding involves “naming segments of data with a label that simultaneously categorizes, summarizes, and accounts for each piece of data” (Charmaz, 2006: 43). It begins by carefully moving line by line through the excerpts within each category and categorizing what is being said, including the actions that are accomplished in participants’ comments. To ensure that the coding is grounded in the data, the researcher sticks closely to the words and actions used by the participants. This goal is also reached by engaging in constant comparison and revisions of codes. If a code can be applied again to another instance of text, it is analyzed for its fit in both instances such that it is interrogated as to whether or not it adequately captures what was expressed in each instance. Doing so enables the researcher to break down the complexity of a text into many codes by constantly testing the adequacy of codes against the data. The researcher then begins to categorize these codes as a means of articulating what is happening in an interview (for graphical overview see Charmaz, 2006: 10). This procedure involves organizing the initial codes into central axes that are *themes* that cover multiple initial codes. Such themes are general concepts that research participants, as a whole, are practically concerned with. They express the *shared phenomena* that emerge in the data and not necessarily the position of any single participant.

In the case of this project, Atlas.ti qualitative analysis software was used to link initial codes to the text and then organize the codes into higher order themes. The software made it possible to begin with the most common initial codes and examine the codes that consistently co-occurred or overlapped

with these most common codes. The results of the interpretive work were presented to the advisory panel for critique. This action served as a check-and-balance.

Overall Findings/Executive Summary

Faith and settlement partnerships are viewed in a mostly positive light. Throughout the interviews there were certain themes that emerged such as networking that could serve to enhance communication between service providers, and enhance services for newcomers without duplicating efforts. Perceptions are also important in cultivating relationships with partner agencies and some of these perceptions can include a misunderstanding of the role of the TSA within the community. There are specific values and aspirations underlying vision for partnership. There are, however, more pervasive values that secure the desire for partnership and willingness to attempt to navigate pitfalls.

Navigating the complexities of the system can be difficult for newcomers. For agencies, navigating through differences in outlook and aspirations while trying to build or maintain partnerships can be difficult and time-consuming. Differences within and among organizations and agencies can be numerous and complex, and in trying to create partnerships between organizations, these differences can be compounded or, with great effort can be transformed into something beneficial for all involved. Partnerships that were particularly promising include those that could engage corps, those that have settlement sector meetings, and those that have collaborative leader groups.

Partnerships between faith and settlement groups could serve to fill many gaps, and faith and settlement leaders could build partnerships by facilitating communication and trust. In encouraging collaboration, policy development can prove to be helpful. Other important collaborative efforts should include focus on desired outcomes and creating flexible policies that incorporate ongoing assessment and room for change. Training and professional development can prove to be important especially where newcomers face struggles as they try to integrate into Canada. In the long run, we can know that

partnerships are successful if we see newcomers getting what they need, and seeing changes in their lives and their well-being.

Vision: To what extent are faith/settlement partnerships viewed positively?

1.1 What are the perceived opportunities for partnership?

Four main themes emerged throughout the discussions on vision and the importance of perceived opportunities for partnerships. Themes include connecting newcomers with church community; building connections within the sector; enhancing services; and making others aware of TSA. All serve to enhance communication between service providers, and enhance services for newcomers without duplicating efforts.

1.1.1 *Connecting Newcomers with Church Community*

One of the strongest themes that emerged in the interviews was that partnerships between faith-based organizations and other members of the settlement sector have the potential to connect newcomers with holistic services. In the TSA case study, this theme entails connecting newcomers with the church because TSA is an organization within the Christian tradition. One participant notes that there is opportunity for mutual learning in this context as “it would be helpful for some settlement agencies to learn about faith issues as well. There are people who are coming [to Canada, and] their faith is very important to them and when [settlement agencies] don't address that part, it's kind of like they are overlooking a big part of that person in a way” (FS007, 271¹). What settlement organizations can learn in the context of this opportunity is that faith is a normal part of personhood and can be discussed like any other deeply meaningful value. The advantage of church communities is that they can freely engage in this domain of everyday life. Discussing faith supports the kind of authentic community

¹ Interview excerpts are identified by a given participant's code and then followed by the line number (in Atlas.ti) where the quotation begins.

where personally meaningful topics can be addressed. The result is the opportunity to connect newcomers with a church community that has freedom to support and engage the whole person.

Connecting newcomers with the church involves applied pressure on TSA to shift its own orientation from one of crisis-oriented service delivery of basic needs, to community development. The vision is that organizations, in reference to TSA, can transform into broader delivery spaces that can support community development. In the words of one participant:

Well I guess even thinking more practically about building community around people... so that they're not isolated as newcomers to Canada, but they have a network of supports around them who can help them navigate through bureaucracy, who can help them to understand the school system... so not just adopting families from a financial perspective but also building that community around families to help them to settle into their new city, their new country. The Salvation Army can't be everything to all people, so we would rely on other people to kind of help with the process of building community, and so referrals to other places and just using the expertise of what's in the communities. (FS006, 197)

This excerpt illustrates the notion of building communities that happen in churches, while simultaneously noting the porous nature of such endeavours, which necessitates reaching out to work with other agencies.

1.1.2 *Building Connections within the Sector*

In reference to opportunities that emerge in partnerships, participants noted that there is the possibility of building relationships within the sector. A realistic assessment of some important realities need to be addressed. One of these realities is that the settlement sector – including faith-based and otherwise – is dynamic and complex. Consider the following comment in this context: “There's just so many social services right in the city that it's just almost like they are a dime a dozen...we think this is a need, so let's fill it instead of really determining, well wait a minute it's being done here, and here, and

here” (FS005, 219). There are many players doing many difference parts. It is valuable to note that connecting is important if we are going to bridge the communication gaps. Several KIs noted that there is a need for information in terms of mapping who does what and what services are available.

An idea emerged, that put forward the possibility of TSA capitalizing on this natural quality by taking a leadership role. In the words of one participant, they noted that “The Salvation Army has a huge reputation... I think that we should use that, the name, just to create an umbrella to reach out to these other people... I think that [The] Salvation Army easily could be a leader in this role” (FS008, 339). There are many ways in which TSA could take such a leadership role and it would be advisable to access the creativity and resources within TSA to develop ways to do this. As an example, one participant noted that an Open House Day at an agency could be a positive option where TSA could “invite partner agencies to come in and [see] this is what we do... that would be the next step ... is to open up our doors to the community, to community providers, and invite them in” (FS010, 75). This opportunity was identified and driven by a keen awareness that it can be hard to get information and there can be consequences for inadequate service delivery.

1.1.3 *Enhancing Services*

Enhanced partnerships have the opportunity to enhance services. One KI mentioned that “in working with faith-based and non-faith-based organizations...I think we are always looking to strengthen our working relationships and looking at ways to do that...To help share information and resources [to make] our services more accessible and beneficial to the individuals that we both serve” (FS012, 140). Partnerships are supposed to lead to enhancing service by creating a “pool of resources” that are more transparent and available. If government resources are available for use, partnerships can enable a more efficient use of those resources. Repetition will occur if services cannot be enhanced through partnerships. There is a deeply rooted commitment to partnerships as activities that bridge service gaps and contribute to a positive community overall.

One of the most common service enhancements would be increased efficiency in the delivery of services. One of the positive outcomes perceived from partnerships is tied to how people in the field “try to avoid duplication of services. We see what resources are outside, and available for our clients and we are a good resource for them, because we see all kinds of clients, even non-status... so there are certain parts of the population they cannot see but we can, so they send them to us” (FS011, 159). The duplication of services goes hand-in-hand with bridging a gap where some clients (persons without legal status in Canada) would not be served were it not for the role that faith-based organizations play. We see that KIs believe in the potential for more efficiency as well as helping others who would be missed otherwise.

1.1.4 Making Others Aware of TSA

Another opportunity that KIs presented was that partnerships can make others aware of what TSA is and what it does. In the words of one KI, “we’ve worked, we have good policies in place in terms of being welcoming, in terms of being inclusive, like those policies are in place. So the missing gap is people knowing this is a good place to send people to” (FS003, 217). TSA has made a clear effort to make services accessible. Part of this opportunity lies in an effort to improve a perceived concern that others do not know that TSA is a community open to serving others: “I’ve heard people that say oh “my client is a Muslim”, or “my client is a whatever, whatever, is he still accepted?” And so one of the things that we always say, we’re inclusive of everyone” (FS010, 71). Part of this misunderstanding was presented as coming from TSA’s Christian identity.

Another part of it comes from how it has developed a niche for being a place that provides practical services like food and clothing, which overshadows its ability to support community in a wider sense. TSA has gyms and space available for community use but another significant contribution can be missed, which is that TSA often fills niches that are not always addressed (e.g., assistance to non-status persons). Community members can miss how TSA can help a range newcomers with their paper work

and these include non-status people that cannot be assisted through government funded agencies. A result is that some KIs identified how there is a need for taking responsibility to make TSA known in terms of what it does beyond crisis intervention. In short, this effort involves taking the responsibility to both promote community awareness of what TSA has to offer and also the requirement to be aware of the community needs.

1.2 What are the perceived pitfalls for partnership?

Perceptions are important in cultivating relationships with partner agencies. Misunderstanding of the role of the TSA within the community is one such barrier that prevents newcomers and agencies from approaching or collaborating with the TSA. Other barriers to partnership include navigating the complexities of the system as well as difficulties in obtaining funding.

1.2.1 *Misunderstanding TSA*

The most prevalent pitfall that comes from partnerships is the relative position of TSA in terms of how it is perceived by potential partners. KIs felt like a pitfall of partnership is not always being treated like an equal where “particularly bigger organizations [act as if] ‘the Salvation Army is smaller than us’... [and] we are not always taken seriously” (FS013, 145). The perceived stigma from potential partners is that TSA is there for the drunks on the street, and so “there is kind of a legitimacy process you have to go through to prove oh no I can be at this table” (FS003, 149). The KIs note that this pitfall is not wholly ungrounded because they identify that having services in a church could itself be a barrier and their denominational affiliation may lead to partners thinking that newcomers “have to be a Salvationist to come to other programs here” (FS001, 20). Moreover, TSA has a distinct identity that makes it “hesitant to be a part of that bigger collaborative, because we are not seen with the picket signs and lobbying, we are not lobbyists... We want to maintain good relations with our government partners, because they’re partners as well, and they are our funders” (FS006, 215). Lastly, the TSA is itself in a state of transition with regards to faith and settlement and this transition can impact

perceptions from others on the outside. The KIs reported that, currently, TSA does not have a well-developed policy on training and that “the majority of people working with the Salvation Army do not know about immigration, or immigration issues... [and what is needed is] education, and being aware that we have to reflect the community outside. And we don't” (FS011, 427). It is important to know that, as mentioned above in reference to opportunities, TSA is taking efforts to reach out. For example, some TSA officers have gone through a formal process to obtain a letter of permission allowing them to wear clothing outside of the traditional TSA uniform. The rationale was that the uniform perpetuates misconceptions and potentially enhances a power differential. This is an example where officers in the TSA have taken, what would be for them, a significant symbolic gesture to reach out.

1.2.2 Challenging for Newcomers to Navigate a System with Different Players

A pitfall to partnership is that there can be multiple parties involved in a newcomer’s experience because no organization, including the TSA can “be everything to all people, so we would rely on... referrals to other places and just using the expertise of what’s in the communities. So almost like navigating the system so that it's to be a benefit to the individuals who are using the system” (FS006, 197). There are multiple players in the system and this is a fact of the complexity of immigration. Challenges to navigating the system can emerge through duplication of services where, for example, one partner can open a thrift store with vouchers like TSA, which would be confusing for clients who may not apprehend the distinction. Other confusions are the relatively different journeys taken by Government Assisted as opposed to Privately Sponsored refugees. Or surprises such as a privately sponsored family discovering, upon arriving at the airport, that they are going to a stranger’s house and not a hotel, while knowing that a friend had a completely different arrival experience. Canada’s comparatively well-developed infrastructure and bureaucracy means that it is a policy/process oriented place that can be hard to grasp and manage. That is, the downside to this necessary complexity is that it can be hard to navigate a system with different players. Newcomers can be involved with many

different people that try to help or “they go to other agencies that are not government funded but they have someone that is doing the same like me [...or] they rely on friends that have been doing the same thing... but sometimes it’s not the best because [immigration] forms keep changing pretty much every two weeks now” (FS008, 53).

A compounding challenge is that difficult backgrounds and experiences put significant personal demand on the participants. For example, “they just get really paranoid and worried and so that becomes the primary concern for them, and we are trying to get them to focus on housing and [other] things and obviously that takes precedence” (FS009, 190). Navigating the Canadian system of players can be challenging, but previous experiences can compound the strain from a process that can be long and draining. Recognizing this challenge leads to workers wanting to help because the need is so clearly obvious to them. However, many workers cannot devote the time to helping someone navigate a complicated system. For example, a frontline worker at a food bank may deal with a significant number of high-needs newcomers that have several barriers to moving easily through the system (e.g. language barriers, past trauma). Community mapping – i.e. identifying and documenting community resources – is an excellent idea but needs to be undertaken with the understanding that partnership necessarily involves a complex system.

1.2.3 Funding Complexities

Another pitfall to partnerships is that there are significant complexities surrounding the issue of funding. KIs explained that persons at higher levels of TSA were always working on how to maximize funds and plan where it is going. As one KI put it, the issue is compounded in the settlement sector because, “in serving the population that we do, income and resources can be scarce... the biggest challenge for us is funding. That won't be uncommon to most organizations” (FS012, 53). It is a contextual factor of the settlement sector that there is not likely to be sufficient funds for the perceived needs. Compounding this complexity is how that funding can be precarious, and one KI noted that it is

especially the case for potential non-faith funders where “the complaint is always funding, and sometimes government cuts funding like [*snaps fingers*]” (FS011, 235). This creates an environment of concern where there can be duplication of services and a mentality where programs compete for participants or, in the words of one KI, engage in “chasing clients” (FS008, 47). These sorts of challenges can be hard to navigate in partnership activities because there are cascade effects. For example, when funding to a non-faith organization goes down or resources are removed in place of web-based tools, a gap opens that is often filled by a faith-based organization. Delivery can be impacted by funding partnerships where municipal funding, for example, can prohibit working with some clients.

Such challenges are compounded by internal challenges with the TSA where allocation of funding within the system can be complicated. For example, one KI noted that “I wish we can have more settlement workers, or someone specialized just in immigration... to be more useful in the community” (FS011, 235). Another KI observed that “The Salvation Army's resources are spread thin and they are, I mean you can't just stop funding one thing to fund something else, I recognize that. But I think the challenge is that... the predominance of funding is in the crisis-based care, as opposed to with things we could do that could help people land and be grounded better, so they don't hit crisis” (FS003, 249). There is a limited pool of resources and the opportunities for partnership raise the challenge of negotiating internal funding. Programs that may seem like a good idea may not be financially realizable or easily sustainable. One KI noted that TSA offers programs for a very low cost and works very hard at being cost efficient, which includes paying lower wages. Attracting and retaining highly qualified people to support new initiatives is challenging. It is simply hard to fund new initiatives that new partnerships may entail in addition to there being competition.

1.2.4 Perceived Incompatibilities

A pitfall that emerges with partnership activities is that organizations must grapple with perceived incompatibilities. While there are some practical incompatibilities like differing rules and

practices in service delivery, a more significant issue that the KIs identified is that faith-based organizations often bring issues of mission and identity to the foreground. Such discussions are central as faith-based organizations are directed to general questions relatively more often than other organizations, which are comparatively more oriented to pragmatics of service. The result is a sentiment where, as one KI noted, “there is sometimes a challenge of how to secure our mission in the midst of a partnership, you know... but other organizations have wanted us to compromise but it's just something that we need to be always aware of that we don't compromise our values, our mission for [whatever] activities we are involved in” (FS006, 111).

Some KIs noted that there is a desire to work with others, and members of the TSA are concerned about giving the impression that one is trying to convert others:

I would say a lot of the Christian groups are scared to share their faith in some ways, they are scared that they're going to go overboard and it's going to seem like they are only supporting if the refugees convert. And that's not their intention at all, and because they're so scared of giving that impression, they are not saying anything. So they're kind of backing away from the expression of why they are doing it (FS007, 121).

Such action compounds the pitfall because it can look as if mission is being eroded and this perception can be even more magnified in conjunction with the depth of the relationship: “if it's just a networking group where you're just coming together, sharing ideas and saying, you can borrow this and here is a sample document that you can borrow, you can use, and that's different, it's kind of a loose partnership. It's when we get more into partnerships where we are sharing staff, facilities and programs” (FS006, 143) that the forgoing pitfalls become enhanced and, potentially, obstructive to partnerships.

1.2.5 Missing Information

A drawback of partnerships is the challenge of ensuring that there is robust and adequate communication of information. KIs noted that there can be a communication gap where one party is

taking action that will have a direct impact on partners, but there is a lack of clarity about ensuing implications. A particularly pervasive example is the government deciding to accommodate a significant number of Syrian refugees and communicating this decision through the media without first speaking with settlement and faith-based organizations. KIs reported that this is an example of how one can hear information from an indirect source and not know what is happening, which can be especially challenging in partnership situations. That is, a current service gap is that there can be insufficient networks for communicating: “I think there is no network for agencies that are not government funded or they are faith-based, that we can just communicate about what we're doing for newcomers or refugees or non-status people, or for long-term residents that are in financial struggle or whatever reason... there is not that network” (FS008, 287). The pitfall of partnership is that this gap could be insufficiently addressed unless there is specific attention.

A related difficulty was that transmitting information from one partner to another can be challenging in the context of new partnerships. KIs noted that other workers in organizations sometimes may withhold information that could prohibit a newcomer from receiving service. While this action is a caring attempt to help newcomers receive services, it does a disservice to partners. When there are multiple partners involved in service delivery, it becomes hard to track newcomers to make sure that they are not lost, but there is no effective system for tracking. Likewise, there is often not adequate communication and opportunity for medium or long-term follow-up as “you don't see the results of what you do. So people get discouraged, but then the need is still there, so there is that tension” (FS011, 347). These current challenges highlight the importance of transmitting information and the potential difficulties that partnerships raise in this domain.

1.3 What underlying motivations, values and aspirations inform these opinions?

Much of the forgoing addressed specific values and aspirations underlying vision for partnership. There were, however, more pervasive values that undergird the desire for partnership and willingness to

attempt to navigate pitfalls. In this section, we address some of these ubiquitous values that undergird the vision for partnership.

1.3.1 *Sense of Community*

One value that ran throughout the KI interviews is the importance of developing a sense of community and how partnerships can enable this. A sense of community is having a sense that one is known and belongs somewhere and KIs took the position that “you are a name not a number so that’s why we really encourage that and if there is a language barrier, we try to connect one of our existing parents with the new parent of the same language, of the same culture” (FS002, 13). A sense of community involves the perception that one is treated like a whole person and it means that TSA must care for someone “as a whole, not just like we are only concerned about making sure that you know, you get a job and earn a house but we are also concerned about you as a person, and how you are dealing with living here. And that you feel like you belong here, and you feel like you know people and you are not all isolated” (FS007, 283). It involves providing a place for newcomers to do things like participate in a sewing group where they can have a space for emotional and social support and “they’re just happy to be able to come to a place where people... [accept] them for who they are... language challenges or plain challenges... You’re here for a break, you’re here for a cup of coffee. Bring your children here and just, we’ll try and figure it out” (FS002, 257). Partnership is presented as important because it can link newcomers with a place that enables a sense of community.

The reason that a sense of community is such a driving value is that the KIs are keenly aware of how people can come to Canada and become isolated or depressed as they often land without a sense of community. KIs noted that newcomers...

[are] leaving their countries, not because they want to live in a better place but because they are fleeing their country, then coming to another country with a different culture is choking enough. Like, it's hard. And then we need the space for spiritual development and spiritual

expression, and if the only way to do it is by learning English first, it's not safe. The language of the spirit is the mother tongue, we can express ourselves in other languages if we are trained, but to feel comfortable learning and experiencing God or whatever your religion is, in your own language. (FS011, 339)

This excerpt illustrates how newcomers can become very isolated because of language barriers. It is normal to find a community for social support, and this is possible when a community is not just needs-based. It involves authentic relationships that run deeper than cultural celebrations in intercultural pot-lucks or dinners after church. It involves a place where a newcomer is treated as an equal with legitimate personhood in her or his own right rather than an object of pity or care.

1.3.2 Meeting the Needs of Newcomers

The value of partnerships enabling a sense of community is related to another important value that drives a desire for partnerships: a deeply rooted care for meeting the needs of newcomers. This value is an expression of empathetic care for others where KIs explain that they sought to “see the difference in peoples’ lives... the testimonials from the individuals saying this is what my life is like now you know. This is what my life was like before this policy, this is what my life is like now” (FS006, 231). This is an example of how change in policy that involves partnerships is understood to be effective. There is a value that newcomers have needs that the KIs would like to see met and so the hope is that...

Our services are able to respond to the needs of individuals and the unique needs of newcomers. I think that means being timely, providing timely services, accessible services, non-judgmental services... I think that being aware of the broader context of what that individual or family may be, whether emotional or psychological or physical, or whatever challenges they may also be experiencing which they may still carry with them. (FS012, 96)

There were a wide range of needs identified – e.g., helping people know their rights, breaking cycles of poverty and violence, providing holistic health, and so forth – but they were unified by a value of the importance of helping and it is that value that drives partnership.

1.4 How and to what extent can differences in motivation/values/aspiration be navigated within policy and practice?

Navigating through differences in outlook and aspirations while trying to build or maintain partnerships can be difficult and time-consuming. It is however, beneficial if substantial connections are to be made. KIs identified key areas of efficiency, developing trust, and leadership as important in navigating gaps and enabling partnerships.

1.4.1 *The Importance of Efficiency*

Aside from emphasizing common values like those mentioned above, one way to navigate differences is to attend to a desired outcome, which KIs often identified as efficiency. Even though partners can have different objectives, purposes, and outcomes, there remains “a strong desire for collaboration in the city so I think whenever like-minded organizations that are doing similar work come around the same table, it can often make work more efficient and outcomes better for the end users” (FS012, 43). Efficiency is a rallying point by which different groups can find grounds for working together. KIs identified that this will likely work because the recent influx of Syrian refugees set up a condition where “they were kind of working in silos before all of this, [and it’s] much better than [it] used to be, which means we’re helping people better because we are talking to each other and addressing needs, filling gaps, eliminating duplication in some ways” (FS007, 93). Attending to efficiency means to evaluate and interrogate one’s own actions. One front-line KI, for example, pondered “Is that my role to look for immigrants to come into my facility and to where I’m working? I don’t know... Are more of us supposed to be doing that to help new immigrants? I don’t know. [Are] there already enough agencies helping?” (FS001, 214). While it may not be this person’s job to create partnerships, engaging in these kinds of questions provides the kind of attention to efficiency that can support partnership

development. On a more pragmatic level, attending to efficiency is associated with relationships that facilitated more communication in a sector that is often dependent on word-of-mouth communication. Such attention means that efforts need to be directed to mutual learning that ensures a two-way flow of information. KIs noted that such efforts enable partnerships through supporting each other via communication motivated by a recognition that a single player cannot do everything.

1.4.2 *Developing Trust*

Another important tactic for navigating differences is developing trust through the kind of actions that partners take. In terms of pragmatic action and grassroots service delivery, one KI noted that “you build trust, right... if you know for example with [*organization name*], the workers I’ve gotten to know really well. And so when they say to me, that this person is such and such... I’m going to likely, incline to believe them... that recognition is really, really important. Knowing the fact that that relationship is really quite valued” (FS010, 87). When there is mutual respect and transparency, it fosters trust through cultivating a sense of recognition and respect. Drawing on partners’ services in an appropriate and respectful manner was embedded in this discussion. For example, KIs noted situations where times had been coordinated, among partners, for newcomers to come when there would be ample staff available to work with people that had language barriers. The plans were not honoured and no communications were forthcoming. Likewise, there were stories about parties withholding information from other parties. These are the sorts of practical actions that erode the trust needed to navigate differences.

At a higher level, there can be situations where a partner is “acting out of turn, and trying to gain more control than the rest... And you find that in any group of people. So just kind of ensuring that there's equal partnership amongst, and there is not somebody trying to take over, force us into something that we are not comfortable being a part of” (FS006, 127). Such activities where one partner can take control over another can erode trust. Navigating differences takes a significant amount of time

and commitment to seeing others' perspectives. If we consider the information above that presented how the values that drive people are often centered around care, we can see how control can feel as if it were a caring activity.

1.4.3 Leadership

Some KIs raised the issue of leadership in terms of navigating differences among partners and the point was raised that faith-based organizations are good places to find natural leaders. Such organizations "could be the catalyst in creating that change... We are good at navigating the few resources and we are good at you know trying to work collaboratively because that is how we have always had to with the lack of resources that we have had" (FS008, 554). Finding creative solutions and ways to collaborate has always been a part of faith-based service delivery and so the milieu of partnership is one in which faith-based institutions ought to be comfortable. That being said, however, a challenge was leveled at faith-based leadership insofar as "... if you want to be a leader you also have to be able to be a follower. And so is [The] Salvation Army willing to be a follower in some sense? Not that you have to follow everybody, but you also have to look at what's happening in the community and look at what other people are doing" (FS010, 154). Leadership that enables partners to navigate tricky differences means putting oneself in a position where one is consistently engaging the wider sector and doing so with a willingness to be on equal footing with others.

The kind of leadership that enables partners to navigate gaps is leadership that promotes working "with the settlement agencies that are local to them to figure out ways to bridge that gap, and bring the newcomers... what they need instead of just, kind of expecting them to show up because they are not going to do that. Get out there and find out what they need" (FS007, 319). Taking the lead in finding information and then taking a lead in focussing on the shared value of wanting to help others is essential for leadership. One KI noted an excellent example of leadership, where she witnessed someone from a different organization "bringing [the conversation] back and saying... 'are you guys

interested in working together and doing this?' And everybody was, and she is all about collaboration herself, so I think that that certainly helped" (FS005, 227). This is the kind of leadership that enables an ethos of partnership.

Structure: What types of partnerships presently exist and how could they be improved?

2.1 What benefits and challenges have emerged as a result of partnership activities?

Differences within and among organizations and agencies can be numerous and complex, and in trying to create partnerships between organizations, these differences can be compounded or, with great effort, can be transformed into something beneficial for all involved. KIs noted the particular benefit of meeting the needs of newcomers through collaboration. Some challenges include a breakdown of processes or plans, and challenges that newcomers have with the system.

2.1.1 Meeting the Needs of Newcomers

When partnerships work, KIs reported that they work well and have tremendous benefits. It was already mentioned how functioning partnerships discourage the duplication of services. Effective partnering relationships allow the needs of newcomers to be met. After all, through “relationships we are able to receive referrals and share information with other organizations to help the individuals we are working with [and] we are also better able to serve [newcomers]” (FS012, 51). Part of the reason that such a benefit emerges is that networks can facilitate awareness because they can inform people about what is currently in place and what sorts of initiatives or changes are soon coming, which keeps people “up-to-date.” (FS008, 91). For example, one KI noted how networks help “parents looking for a program that we don’t offer but [another organization] might and vice versa” (FS002, 67).

An important implication is that partnerships enable people to “stay in touch with community needs but it also helps us acquire professional tools to be better at what we do” (FS003, 141). Partnerships that enable service delivery are founded on prior sharing among people in the field. Such sharing can involve activities like making presentations according to one’s field of knowledge and the kind of work one does. This may result in better strategies for serving newcomers but it doubles as a professional development opportunity for sector workers.

2.1.2 Breakdown of Processes

There is a general class of challenges that emerge from past partnership activities and they are not unified in content, but they share a common theme: **“breakdown”** (FS002, 249). That is, they all address how there was a plan or process in place that somehow did not work. A typical example of a breakdown is one where there is duplication of services. Such situations emerge where two partnered agencies are doing something very similar and competition emerges over who is doing a better job. Consider the converse how, “if we are doing something, and, not that we are doing it better, but if we have more resource of funding okay well let us do it. You know, you can come along and help us with that process.... It's not like... we started it first so we are going to finish it, no... why take it out of two pockets and do half the job, when you can take it out of one and do a great job” (FS002, 602). When there is a duplication of services that results in competition, then breakdown can occur because the overall service delivery can be diminished.

Other breakdowns include instances where a municipality, settlement organization, or larger government funding body can make changes and another agency may not know how to adapt to the change, leaving a breakdown in the flow of service. Communication breakdowns across agencies and through time as newcomers move through their processes of settlement prevents people from knowing who is not getting the services that are needed. These breakdowns also contribute to others having a lack of awareness of what is available and clients missing resources. KIs identify points where they require help with translation when a newcomer comes to a foodbank, or settlement actions when that newcomer needs to apply for proper identification. Breakdowns could occur when other agencies could not provide someone to assist with the need. KIs identify breakdowns such as other groups making mistakes that put TSA at risk by jeopardizing their charitable status number. In sum, there is a general awareness that there could be breakdowns in the current structure of partnerships.

2.1.3 Problems Newcomers Have with the System

When asked about challenges that emerge because of partnership activities, KIs would often transition to a discussion of the kinds of problems that they see newcomers having with the system. From the perspective of the KIs in TSA, challenges were ones based upon empathy with program participants. A significant concern was that workers themselves were too busy to help newcomers navigate multiple partners. KIs speak about not being able to refer people properly – i.e., not ensuring that referrals work and are effective – because of high work demand. A significant issue raised was that people working in the field may be so busy that they “are not connecting with [newcomers], they don't know real needs, they don't know how to help them” (FS011, 655.). Part of the challenge is recognizing that “each situation is unique and different, if the newcomer requires additional steps we let them know” (FS014, 65), which puts demand on workers. A result is a perception that newcomers could become confused and frustrated.

Challenges that KIs report newcomers facing as they navigate through various partners in the settlement sector include frustrations due to the language barrier as one attempts to explain her or his situation repeatedly. The process of settlement involves dealing with a massive number of partners and players which can feel like one is being sent from one place to another with little gain to show. Compounding this sentiment are moments where wrong information can be sent and/or a mistaken or inappropriate referrals can frustrate newcomers and therein put strain on the relationship with those helping them. Frustrations such as differential treatment for different kinds of newcomers (privately versus government sponsored refugees, Syrians versus other nationalities) and the difficulty finding housing, are compounded through the complex system that needs to be navigated.

2.2 What types of partnership activities seem particularly promising?

Most of the KIs, in some way or another, identify specific partnerships that are working and provide opportunities for newcomers to be helped, but more significant points of discussion are three

general categories of activities that seem particularly promising. These include engaging corps in the community, having settlement sector meetings, and having collaborative leader groups.

2.2.1 Engaging Corps in the Community

One of the most interesting and prevalent partnership activities pertains to engaging partners in terms of local congregations that are part of TSA, referred to as “corps”. Engaging corps in the community is about approaching these communities within TSA as if they are a potential external partner². The idea that this is a promising activity was driven by a commitment to TSA and fulfilling its mission. As one KI asked, “are we meeting The Salvation Army's mission fully through the food bank? I am not convinced right now that we are... we've looked at other different models for some other places where they are linking people either to a corps or to another church, right? Integrated mission” (FS005, 129). This notion of “integrated mission” is that TSA is concerned with getting into the communities to help people. It involves helping the whole person and not just conversion to faith, and this concern involves both building communities where people are and bringing people into a community where they can be holistically cared for. That is, integrated mission means that “newcomers can come in and get supports, that's not just needs-based, but is actually community-building based, and child asset development based, then that is going to change the child's trajectory in Canada and then makes them less vulnerable” (FS003, 177). The notion is that corps need to be engaged because they can help provide a service that can make “a transformation in [a] community... So when communities are transformed, that's when you know that something has happened” (FS006, 239). It is about reaching out to form a community and provide a positive impact on others’ lives.

Practically, this proposal relies upon the presupposition that corps are always looking for people, which would then enable more diversity and educate people in the corps about intercultural

² It is interesting to note that KIs often discussed corps and other arms (ministry units) in a manner similar to the discussion of partners outside of TSA.

issues. Newcomers and corps members alike are presented as being able to extend their social networks through such community development.

2.2.2 Settlement Sector Meetings

Another promising activity noted by KIs is the possibility of increasing our involvement in large meetings of settlement sector workers. These could look like large planning tables where “there is one or two persons from every agency in [an] area... sitting around [a] massive bunch of tables and they are trying to work together as one unit” (FS002, 83). These sorts of collaboratives are identified as ideal ways through which KIs could find effective communication and cultivate awareness of what is happening within spheres of influence. For example, such past activities have enabled “a lot more communication between especially the Muslim and Christian groups. Because Christian churches are sponsoring Muslim refugees, and they don't want to offend them and they don't want to make it seem like they are trying to convert them, and that's the only way they'll help them. So there's been a lot of communication and learning between each group, what we are about and understanding each other's faith a bit better” (FS007, 111). Such activities are helpful resources for enhancing expertise and supports transitioning from preventative to asset-based services because “you learn differently when you hear someone just speak from their faith, where they are at with their faith in terms of how a story would impact them. So it wasn't this is what it means to be Muslim in terms of teaching... it was more experienced. And it was so rich” (FS003, 245).

2.2.3 Collaborative Leader Groups

The third general kind of promising activity noted by KIs is the conduct of collaborative working groups among leaders. These collaborative leader groups emerge from the notion that “Churches are really good at running programs so let them run programs. There is no shortage of volunteers in many places... it's kind of modeling the way forward, working with partners and expressing their faith. Just

being a role model for others who are volunteering, or are part of the church” (FS007, 303). It is the notion of role modeling that is important. KIs noted that leaders can meet to work on several issues and, in some cases, this suggestion involves executive directors of organizations meeting to connect and coordinate resources. Prototypes of such activities have already taken place and they include ad hoc groups formed in response to the Syrian crisis. There are other examples of multicultural leadership groups who meet to collaborate to help newcomers, and TSA creating a position with a person who coordinates family services, including newcomer services. This potential activity includes the possibility of TSA leveraging its well-known brand to support change such as advocating for a smoother system of credentialing newcomers and related advocacy.

2.3 What service gaps could faith/settlement partnerships be most effective in addressing?

Partnerships between faith and settlement groups could serve to fill many gaps that have been previously identified throughout this report. Two major themes that were highlighted throughout responses from various KIs were the importance of developing a map of resources that could be accessed by everyone, and providing community for newcomers as they arrive and transition.

2.3.1 Map of Current Resources

One of the challenges that many of the workers in TSA face is that many of the available services are offered to people who need help, and not to newcomers in particular. In many cases, newcomers arrive at the ministry unit looking for support and workers are in need of some sort of compilation or map of current resources. For example, KIs who work in housing note that “selecting housing, and then just basic needs that are required when setting up a new house. So things like food and furniture and things like that. There are a lot of programs in our community, but it requires some familiarity with how to access and who to go to for that” (FS012, 69). It is this sort of gap that KIs feel needs to be filled. Ideas that they presented include ways of keeping current with information such as partnering to

develop some sort of universal website with a list of resources. Other ideas include developing practices parallel to government organizations, which often have fairly good internal communication. The notion is not among non-government organizations, such as some small church running a program, as it may not be accessed because people will not know about it. The overall idea is that such a map will connect with the specific resources people need.

The interviews with KIs open a discussion in relation to mapping that the KIs themselves had not really considered. It was that they may not see service gaps because they would only interact with those for whom processes had worked and so service providers may not be attuned to gaps. Similarly, KIs noted that it may be hard to grapple with stories of unsuccessful settlement because “the language barrier...would prohibit them from telling us this is what happened... If our staff spoke Arabic, it probably would have been a different story” (FS006, 99). The issue that this raises is that mapping or compiling resources could be more important and urgent than one would think because challenges that newcomers have with the system may be underreported.

2.3.2 Providing Community

Given the emphasis that KIs put on developing community in terms of envisioning opportunities for future partnerships, it should not be surprising that a service gap KIs found most likely to be filled by partnerships is the development of community for newcomers. They present how providing community is possible if workers in the settlement sector reach out to newcomers “in their community and that’s where they could work with the settlement agencies that are local to them to figure out ways to bridge that gap... and offer [newcomers] what they need instead of just, kind of expecting them to show up because they are not going to do that” (FS2007, 239). These efforts are about playing a significant and holistic role that is currently not filled and doing so would take initiative on the part of faith-based organizations like TSA. There is a clear vision for how TSA can provide for churches that are multigenerational communities helping with the holistic needs not currently addressed.

One particular service gap that such endeavors are aimed at addressing is the transition that newcomers face where they are dependent on outside support and then must become independent. This transition from dependency to independence is too quick and the risk is that “they're not independent before their sponsorship has finished, or persons who are helping them along the way [say] see you later, [make] it on your own now because funding has been cut, or something like that” (FS002, 514). TSA can be a support that helps newcomers in the midst of this transition by smoothing it out. Such a community can offer support in terms of providing a place where newcomers can contribute while refining their English skills. In the words of one KI, “if there was some sort of way to bridge a kind of a job of some sort, but they are also learning language at the same time, they can feel like they are actually contributing back but still getting the language training that they need... Because most people want to skip the language training and get right to work, but then they are underemployed because they can't speak the language well enough” (FS007, 287). Churches can provide safe transitional communities through providing opportunities to contribute to the community while receiving mentoring and support, which is currently needed.

Process: How can effective partnerships be better facilitated?

3.1 What roles could faith and settlement leaders each play in partnership building?

Faith and settlement leaders could build partnerships by facilitating communication and trust.

Within TSA itself, community must be encouraged in order to provide services that are less crisis-oriented; leaders should increase their voice in the settlement sector and the media; and there needs to be more communication about the role of TSA through community outreach and involvement.

3.1.1 *Roles that Facilitate Communication and Trust*

Most KIs focus their comments on the role of leaders in faith-based organizations, and make some comments about the kind of roles that leaders in both faith and settlement could take up. In general, they claim that both parties need to take roles that facilitate communication and trust. Regardless of which segment of the sector one works, “you need clear communication, you need trust in relationships. And all these things come together to make sure that we are not duplicating services, we are more efficient” (FS002, 604). The smooth partnerships that are effective are predicated on trust and communication. This claim is also a significant challenge because it runs counter to a tendency to produce silos considering a scarcity of resources. It is not as if “people intend to become silos, but there is always less resources and [more] needs. I think that often creates [a situation where] it's harder to be intentional about keeping the walls down” (FS003, 207). The kind of role that is presented is one where leaders need to be conscious about their own attitudes that may not be intentional, “but if they were more intentional of making sure that it's part of the policy that they do cooperate and partner with groups, then it would maybe change attitudes” (FS007, 229). Roles that facilitate communication and trust are ones that are intentionally open-minded where facilitator enables open dialogue.

Leaders that facilitate communication and trust enable effective development knowledge of what is going on in the community. KIs argue that such characteristics can provide a generative context within which sector workers can develop formal networks that keep people informed. It can also

provide grounds for work groups that can kick off efforts and establish networks. Such leadership enables interdependence and, ultimately, better support of newcomers.

3.1.2 Building Community within TSA

KIs argue that leaders need to build community within TSA in the sense that an important role is developing community connections and networks with TSA itself. This unique role of leaders comes from the notion that many settlement agencies are reportedly “more about getting people self-sufficient and being okay on their own. There is not as much time for the social elements of it, they might have some social things going on but they are extras on top of everything else. So I think local churches could come along with settlement agencies and provide that space, and the time for the social things that are needed as well” (FS007, 2013). It is about enabling a situation where people are helped to find and stay in a community instead of, for example, only coming to foodbanks for food. It enables mentors and other holistic relationships and processes that include long term follow-up. This agenda means to make concerted efforts within TSA to cultivate services that are less crisis-oriented, which enable newcomers to flourish in a richer sense.

The kinds of endeavors that enable the construction of community within the TSA are ones described in terms of creating “open spaces” by the KIs. It involves “opening safe spaces for cultural diversity. The assumption that everybody that comes to Canada has to learn English and behave the way Canadians behave is not safe for immigrants, and for refugees it is less safe because of the risk of mental health issues” (FS011, 335). Such open spaces are about cultivating an attitude where others are accepted and one is willing to engage in authentically open conversations. For example, it can include opening up spaces for discussion about religion and faith in a way that foregrounds the importance of diversity and humility that comes from recognizing that others see the world differently. In some cases, it involves linking people to church or whatever community works for them. Regardless of the manifestation, open spaces mean to approach “people as partners and equals, not just the refugees or

newcomers who are coming in, but also the settlement workers who sometimes, they are the experts and it comes with this attitude... But some people approach settlement workers as they are the experts, so we defer to them. [We need to recognize] that the church leaders have expertise in another area, so they are equals” (FS007, 311). Leaders within TSA taking steps to facilitate the development of such communities can fill a niche in the settlement sector and enrich TSA.

3.1.3 Increasing their Voice in the Settlement Sector

KIs also put forward the idea that leaders of faith-based institutions, such as TSA, should make an effort to increase their voice in the settlement sector. This role involves taking steps to fund what information is available and then using such information to be a catalyst for positive change. It means to continue to support people financially and pragmatically, but expanding into a role where one uses networking resources to help/advocate for newcomers. Groups of leaders can have impact by getting attention from government, and policy development is described as involving an engagement with government policy: “I see our role sometimes as being advocacy as well, so even connecting with our MPs and our MPPs, because a lot of policy development is like government policy development that impacts the individuals that we serve... I could see you know, policy development amongst the agencies, but also what has a bigger impact is what's coming down from policy from government” (FS006, 205).

The reason that faith-based organizational leaders are ideal for this role is that they are potentially still in contact with those working with newcomers and can function as intermediaries that share what real life is like for immigrants. It ultimately means to provide a voice for newcomers because “they wouldn't have a voice, you know, like a lot of people don't have a voice. Like people in our shelters, we're their voice, right? New immigrants, we would be their voice in government, they wouldn't have that power or the know-how of getting their message to whoever needs to hear it” (FS006, 343). The role also means to be a voice that deals with the media: “So the thing is when you are trying to help clients sometimes what you feel is that people that are on the other side. For example,

workers or even citizens, they don't feel so okay for you to help refugees because they are burdening the system based on what the media said" (FS008, 69). It involves taking the role of having a stronger voice in relation to government and media to tell the other side of the story for workers and newcomers.

3.1.4 Communicating about TSA

The role of increasing voice in relation to government and media also means that leaders in TSA will naturally take on the role of communicating about TSA. This role involves "identifying my sphere of influence as my team. Right now I am not in a position that my sphere of influence extends beyond it, this is my team, so I do work here but if people want to talk to me, I will talk to them. But I have to start with where I am" (FS003, 261). This excerpt is an example of the importance of starting where one is at and communicating with others that TSA is a safe place. It involves taking up the role of reaching out within one's sphere of influence to showcase what TSA can provide. KIs describe situations where they have been working in a community for a long time (e.g., more than 15 years) and others in the community don't know about the services. The kinds of activities that this role involves include strategic planning which involves community awareness, trying to attend and be visible at as many sector meetings as possible, and reaching out to community centers, mosques, and temples.

3.2 How could collaborative program planning and policy development be encouraged?

In encouraging collaboration, KIs identified networking opportunities that start with face-to-face discussion where a group of focused individuals discuss policy that will meet the needs of newcomers. Other important collaborative efforts should include focus on desired outcomes, and creating flexible policies and procedures that incorporate ongoing assessment and room for change.

3.2.1 *Creating Face-to-Face Networking Opportunities*

One of the ways that collaborative program planning and policy could be developed is through creating face-to-face networking opportunities. In the words of one KI, TSA could direct “to reach out to other non-government agencies or faith-based agencies, to see what you guys are doing for refugees and immigrants that the agencies that are government-funded are not doing. And start just creating meetings and eventually create a committee to see what we can change” (FS008, 351). Face-to-face meetings is suggested because word-of-mouth is the best way to spread information in the settlement sector, despite that it may seem like an antiquated mode. The settlement sector is one where promotion of what is being done and dissemination of best practices still happens best in conversation. To find out who is doing what outside and inside of government organizations, interactive networking activities are the best, which is a reality of how the settlement sector works. It is in the context of such networking opportunities that mapping of services can be developed. The following step is to then capitalize on relationships through the creation of distribution lists and emailing monthly updates.

Just like face-to-face networking precedes electronic communication, it also precedes policy development. This is because policy in this area “would go back to referrals, we need to develop some kind of policy that we can be referred to... whether it be policy over how often we are redeveloping [things] that we can deliver... we have good policies in place in terms of being welcoming, in terms of being inclusive” (FS003, 217). The kind of policy that matters in this area is about relationships and so it needs to be grounded in relationships. The importance of relationships is also seen in how such networking and subsequent policy is possible when there are people directing networks that have “a clear understanding of the purpose of the meeting, and then somebody who is well aware of what works and what doesn't to kind of be the lead for the meeting... So I think really being able to ascertain that, and having the right people at the table without having too many people at the table. Because then I think you're not really going to get anywhere” (FS005, 217). Networking needs to initially be face-to-face and driven by focused persons.

3.2.2 Focus on Desired Outcomes

Another way to encourage collaborative planning and programming is to keep players focused on the desired outcomes. One KI said “you know what, everyone can be all policies and procedures and things like that, but it all comes down to the heart we've all got the same heartbeat, right... it's just you know pushing a different paper” (FS002, 614). This is an expression of the idea that multiparty engagement (i.e., buy-in) happens when efforts tap into people’s passions and a core passion of many in the settlement sector is enabling a better settlement experience for newcomers. It is in this context that “we have to define our priorities; and if we want to be present in the current movement of society we have to be present in the multicultural community and making that a priority... like if we don't care the opportunity may be gone in a few years” (FS011, 803). This excerpt illustrates how there is a window of opportunity coupled with the setting of priorities and so there is an urgency to keeping players focussed on the outcomes. Such focus energizes and can harmonize efforts to change what is possible to change and providing practical assistance, which includes housing, community, and other basic needs associated with both crisis interventions and broader preventative action.

3.2.3 Creating Flexible and Open Policies and Procedures

A particular desired outcome that encourages collaborative planning and policies is creating flexible/open policies and procedures. This outcome is about reshaping policy to emphasize the importance of networking and personal relationships, which explicitly defines them as important. Such policies and procedures allow people to link up with others and advocate for themselves because “it's important for programs like ours to maintain practices and policies that allow for flexibility, so that resources don't become too restrictive and that there is accommodation for meeting the needs of newcomers as well” (FS012, 84). Encouraging collaborative planning and policies in this manner means that “we should always be looking at policy, I think we should always be changing and trying to [meet] the needs of our community and the needs of our clients. I think The Salvation Army is really good at

always trying to change and be adaptive” (FS009, 311). It is about building ongoing assessment and dynamic change into policies and procedures.

It is interesting to note a point of tension where some KIs feel like TSA is adaptive while others feel like more adaptive policy is needed because they see the TSA as rigid. This point of tension is important to explore because it may reveal weak points where TSA is not diverse, which could be detrimental to those it tries to serve. For example, one KI noted that “In Toronto, 51% of the population is immigrant and [TSA is] not even close to that. People are coming to our congregations, and we see them as clients but not as part of what we are... So the big white institutions helping the poor immigrants, that's what we do” (FS011, 443). This is a strong claim but it should not be dismissed because the consequences for the long-term viability of TSA could be harmed as society becomes increasingly intercultural. TSA may be ill advised to miss out on the opportunity to develop policies and procedures that allow its members to hear immigrants’ stories.

3.3 What training and professional development activities could be developed or shared?

There are multiple issues that newcomers face as they try to integrate into Canada. These include issues of mental health that can be overlooked by those in service, or language barriers that prevent delivery of quality service. Training for workers in these areas, cultural sensitivity training, and training in understanding the immigration process can be beneficial for those delivering services.

3.3.1 Cultural Sensitivity Training

One form of training and professional development needed by KIs is cultural sensitivity training. One KI noted that “because I was taking the settlement worker course, it helped me a lot to understand... it's just actually normal for them” (FS004, 139) in terms of certain behaviours and norms. Such training can be provided by partners and it allows workers in TSA – many of whom have happened into working with newcomers without a specific mandate to do so – to be reflective and more understanding. This enhances service delivery because it helps “them to understand more about

different cultures. Because sometimes in that ignorance, we make judgments on people. So just helping people understand other cultures” (FS006, 257). Nonjudgmental understanding helps us better work with others and be realistic about what others can do. It also has the effect of enabling people to grant newcomers more dignity and respect.

3.3.2 Better Understanding Immigration Processes and Settlement

Training and professional development are needed to help workers better understand the immigration process and settlement more generally. This need comes from how “our corps officers, like they wouldn't understand you know the immigration process... it's just not within their scope of work, but if somebody came and needed to know... how can I assist this person that's coming to our corps now, running into problems with immigration, could be deported, you know... So even something around that, a ‘what if’” (FS006, 277). It is really important that TSA in general would benefit from some training on what it looks like to land in Canada and navigate the system. One KI points out that corps officers aren't better informed because of the excessive demands put upon them, but highlights a telling irony: “it's not... the busy corps officer being bothered by us trying to train that corps officer or their staff to help immigrants... It's the poor corps officer, with no knowledge on immigration or multiculturalism” (FS011, 619). Training in issues of immigration and multiculturalism are simple facts of ministry.

3.3.3 Realizing Mental Health Issues Faced by Newcomers

A third area of training relates to mental health issues faced by newcomers. This sort of training means exposing workers to all the difficulties that newcomers face when they arrive to Canada, how that impacts mental health, and what people working with newcomers can do to help. It means to distribute information to churches in forms such as “training programs for sponsor groups... to manage expectations, to be prepared for the arrival, what to be looking for... to offer emotional and social support. Where the problems might be coming up, things to be aware of, those kinds of training

resources that we could kind of spread out a bit better so that people are just aware of what to look for and how to handle it if it does come up” (FS007, 267). It involves articulating the shared experiences and difficulties encountered in the process of settlement, not yet on professional development.

3.3.4 *Newcomers that Need ESL*

The fourth area where training is needed relates to teaching and dealing with newcomers that need English as a second language support. Having “English as a second language... is a process because some people think that they can just teach English because they speak it well, no they really can't... there is a process... from the minor things to actually formulating, and that process is very important and I think if we had training in those sorts of things [it] would really help” (FS002, 442). That is, such training can help provide more effective services to newcomers and how to establish an effective language or conversation class.

3.4 How could partnerships that support immigrants of faith be best evaluated?

It was evident that statistical evaluations are not enough for presenting how effective partnerships are in supporting immigrants, but that people getting what they need and seeing changes in their lives and their well-being is important. Developing healthy relationships is also important in effective partnerships, as well as developing a system where satisfaction surveys could be utilized.

3.4.1 *Ensuring People Get What They Need*

One consistent indicator that changes are effective is simply that people get what they need. Change is effective when there is a “difference in peoples’ lives, when it's a positive change in their lives... sometimes it will be measuring the number, you know, collecting the statistics and writing up the numbers in that kind of thing. But it's more, the testimonials from the individuals saying this is what my life is like now, you know” (FS006, 231). In the case of first-step type services for newcomers when they first arrive, it means that newcomers move on to other services. Overall well-being and state of life has

improved such that it is possible to say that they are moving forward in some way and not experience mental health issues.

In the case of more immigrants in second-step programming where newcomers have found basic needs like housing and employment, it involves a stabilization where they, in the case of newcomers of faith “are becoming just ingrained in that community of faith, and they themselves are growing in their experience. That's not always easy to measure, but again it's more observation as to behaviour changes, or what they are voicing of their experiences. Like testimonials is usually the best way of knowing how things are going” (FS006, 251). Changes are effective if they better enable newcomers to contribute to a community and help develop it. Regardless of the stage in the process, effective change in multiparty collaboration is assessed with more people getting what they need from the programs that are offered.

3.4.2 *Developing Healthy Relationships*

A related indicator of effective change among partners is the development of healthy relationships in the lives of newcomers. That is, “they are feeling like they belong in Canada, that they are welcomed and a part of this community. An equal part that someone who is coming to be helped, but someone who is contributing as well” (FS007, 237) and that they “are being effectively integrated when they are becoming parts of the community, and the community is welcoming them in” (FS007, 249). This indicator involves newcomers integrating into a community that makes them less vulnerable – i.e., that protects them like any form of social support – and treats them as equal contributors where they give back to the community. In other words, effective change is marked by “an interest in learning what the needs of other cultures are, and how are we going to meet those needs. Not as clients, but as communities, being part of the community... relationships” (FS011, 459).

3.4.3 Tracking Data

Another indicator of effective change is tied to more traditional methods of research: surveys for improvement and/or tracking data. This sort of assessment could involve techniques such as satisfaction surveys or measuring process times to see if there's "improvement" compared to baseline data. Such efforts require initial establishment of documentation methods. Other options include something like an inter-partner client management system that can enhance communication across sectors. All such endeavors are basically a form or some sort of planner pre- and post- intervention assessment.

Conclusions

The importance of partnerships was highlighted throughout the study. Whether it entailed networking, accommodating, opening the doors of TSA, or changing policies to adapt to new situations, healthy partnerships are a goal. Some of the barriers to newcomers accessing services can include their transitional issues such as language barriers, or recovering from mental illness or past trauma. Other barriers include a breakdown in communication within the system established to help them navigate through immigration and integrate into communities. There are barriers that workers have a heart to remove or repair so that newcomers can integrate better into Canadian society and find deeper relationships that improve their lifestyle and outlook.

In moving forward, it is imperative that the suggestions given are discussed and implemented. These include training and professional development, enhancing services, developing trust, and creating a map of resources, and are imperative to moving toward sustainable partnerships and working more efficiently. Recommendations for future direction include: (1) interviewing partners from government and settlement sectors; (2) interviewing newcomers to gather their personal experiences; and (3) assessing relationships within TSA after the implementation of suggestions.

References

- Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: University of Austin Press.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Langfield, M. (2004). Voluntarism, Salvation, and Rescue: British Juvenile Migration to Australia and Canada, 1890–1939. *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, .32(2) 86–114.
- Maddox, R. (1994). *Responsible grace: John Wesley's practical theology*. Nashville: Kingswood books.
- Moyles, G. (2017). "Help for Manitoba's Farmers and Housewives": The Salvation Army as an Official Immigration Agency. *Manitoba History*, 83, 35-40.
- Street, R. (2002). *Servants together: Salvationist perspectives on ministry*. London: Salvation Army Books.

Appendix A: Interview Guide

(1) Review of Consent form & study outcomes

(2) Main Body Questions

- a. [Demographics] We are interested in gathering some background information about you and your work. This information helps us better understand your answers because they can be placed in context. Please do not feel obliged to answer any questions that you would rather not answer.
 - i. We realize that there may be many different people that you work with. Some may be immigrants and some may not. Can you briefly describe the work that you do with immigrants to Canada?
 - ii. What is the title of your current role?
 1. How long have you been in this role?
 - iii. Please briefly describe the educational background and/or any other training that you have, regardless of whether or not it directly relates to your role or working with newcomers.
 - iv. Please describe what previous experience you have that prepares you to do the kind of work that you do, regardless of whether or not it directly relates to your role or working with newcomers.

- b. [Structure] We are interested on your perspective **about the relationships** among your ministry unit (or The Salvation Army more broadly) and government-funded and other non-faith based settlement organizations. There are some questions below that discuss these relationships. If one of the questions does not seem to apply to your situation, please feel free to let me know and we can move on to something more applicable.
 - i. What are some of the organizations that you directly interact with on a regular basis?
 - ii. Are there organizations that you may not necessarily interact with directly, but they still impact your work?
 1. If there are, what are these organizations?
 2. How do they impact you?
 - iii. Are there any other community networking collaboratives that your agency is involved with?
 - iv. Are there positive outcomes that come from your work with government-funded and other non-faith based organizations?
 1. If there are, can you describe them?
 - v. Are there challenges that emerge in your work with government-funded and other non-faith based organizations?
 1. If there are, can you describe them?

- c. [Process] We are interested in your perspective of how things work. That is, we are interested in the **general processes that you see newcomers going through**. These processes include how they move through your ministry unit (or The Salvation Army more broadly) and government-funded and/or other non-faith based organizations. There are some questions below that discuss these processes. If one of the questions does not seem

to apply to your situation, please feel free to let me know and we can move on to something more applicable.

- i. Please briefly describe the “journey” newcomers take through your organization.
 1. Are there any extra steps that newcomers have to go through first?
 2. Are any parts of the process that newcomers find challenging to understand because they don't have the Canadian experience yet?
 - ii. Are there additional roles faith and settlement leaders could each play in developing new processes that could change this “journey”?
 1. If there are, how could more collaborative program planning be encouraged?
 2. If there are, how could more policy development be encouraged?
 3. How could we evaluate the effectiveness of these changes?
 - iii. Are there additional roles faith and settlement leaders could each play in developing ways to support immigrants of faith in particular?
 1. If there are, what would these roles be?
 2. How could we best evaluate partnerships that support immigrants of faith?
 - iv. In light of current and potential processes, what more training and professional development activities could be developed or shared?
- d. [Vision] We are interested in your perspective on what **potential changes to the kinds of relationships that** you have with government-funded and other non-faith based settlement organizations. If one of the questions does not seem to apply to your situation or you feel like you have already addressed it above, please feel free to let me know and we can move on to something more applicable.
- i. What opportunities for relationships among organizations should be pursued or strengthened?
 1. Why do you think such opportunities should be pursued or strengthened?
 2. What benefits could emerge as a result of building these new relationships?
 3. Why do you think such new relationships could be particularly promising?
 - ii. Can you describe any service gaps that could be addressed with new relationships among faith/settlement organizations?
 1. What challenges have emerged as a result of partnership activities?
 - iii. What role could faith and settlement leaders each play in partnership building?
 - iv. What training and professional development activities have been developed or shared?
 - v. Given what you know about how the relationship between your ministry unity (or The Salvation Army more broadly speaking) and government-funded and other non-faith based settlement organizations works, how could change be best brought about?

(3) Conclusion

- a. Review of consent form & opportunity to withdraw consent.
- b. Debriefing Script:

Thank you for taking part in our research project. Let me remind you once more that you may decide not to let us use the information that you have provided during participation in this study. If so, just let me know and your request will be honored.

I'd like to ask you a couple of questions about your feelings about the interview itself.

- *What were your general impressions of the study? Do you have any general questions or concerns?*
- *Did you understand the instructions? Were they reasonably clear?*
- *Were you comfortable talking about your personal experiences, and how do you feel about that part of the study now?*

This interview is part of case study in The Salvation Army and it part of a much larger project conducted by the Centre for Community Based Research. The overarching purpose of the project is to collaboratively investigate partnerships among faith-based and government-funded settlement organizations, and to determine how these partnerships can better lead to positive settlement outcomes for newcomers and ultimately benefit Canadian society. The research is being carried out in two Ontario sites (Greater Toronto and Waterloo/London).

Effective social systems (and partnerships within them) consider three dimensions: vision, structure and process. Within our study, the social system under investigation is the network of settlement supports. Consequently, vision refers to the motivations, values, and aspirations that provide direction for supporting immigrant settlement (*why* support). Structure refers to the settings, activities and events that help to support immigrants (*what* support looks like). Process refers to actions that enable people to implement the vision of supporting immigrants (*how* to better support). We have found this to be a useful theoretical framework in previous research (including SSHRC-funded) exploring immigrant settlement within faith-based settings. Consistent with the framework's three dimensions, the study's main research questions are:

- (1) To what extent is the idea of faith/settlement partnerships being embraced? (vision)
- (2) What types of partnerships presently exist and how could they be improved? (structures)
- (3) How can effective partnerships be better facilitated? (processes)