

Immigration Settlement Service Gaps in British Columbia's Rural Regions

**Dr. Miu Chung Yan
Jenny Francis
University of British Columbia**

**E-SYMPOSIUM:
Immigrant Research in BC and CANADA
December 11, 2014**



a place of mind

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Background

1. General:

1. Part of the study: Determining immigrant settlement services & gaps in CIC's western region
2. Hosted by Institute of Rural Development, Brandon University
3. 33 rural communities without LIP in 4 provinces and 3 territories
4. Newcomers: Permanent Residents, Refugees, Refugee Claimants, Temporary Foreign Workers (TFW), Naturalized Citizens, and International Students that have been in Canada from 1 day to 5 years

2. British Columbia

1. Provincial Panel: CIC, BC Government and AMSSA
2. 10 communities
3. Survey: CIC funded and other SPOs
4. Feedback meeting to verify data



Region	Community	Pop'n 2011*	PR Arrivals 2008-13**	Surveys comp'd	FB
Interior	Kamloops	98,754	1,420	3	1
Kootenays	Cranbrook	25,037	268	4	2
	Kimberley	6,654	115		
	Nelson	10,230	315	3	0
	Trail	7,681	68		
	Grand Forks	4,100	35		
Vancouver Island	Nanaimo	98,021	1,423	3	1
	Port Alberni	17,743	170	2	0
Northeast	Prince Rupert	12,508	171	5	0
	Terrace	15,569	157	6	5
	Kitimat	8,335	110		
	Smithers	5,404	124		
Sea to Sky	Squamish	17,479	642	6	5
	Whistler	9,824	1,242		
Lower Mainland	Langley	104,109	3,490	6	2
Sunshine Coast	Powell River	13,165	163	5	1
	Sechelt	9,291	204		
	Gibsons	4,437	227		
BRITISH COLUMBIA		4,400,057 [†]		43	17



Immigration and BC: Some Facts

1. Majority PRs fall into Economic Immigrant Categories
2. Mainly from Asia and Pacific region
3. Temporary residents (TFW, Int Student, Refugee claimant and humanitarian) are *two times* more than PRs
e.g., 2012, PR36,241 vs. TR78,372.
4. Canada: increasing number of transition from TR to PR, from 69,274 (2008) to 79,154 (2012)
5. Decreasing number of immigrants to BC but increasing number not living in CMA, 4.2% (2003) to close to 8% (2012)
 1. Economic driven: jobs, housing, and study.



Settlement and Integration

1. 59.5% (very difficult or somewhat difficult) vs. 40.5% (somewhat easy)
2. 76.2% agreed >25% of newcomers find it difficult to access services in their community.
3. All respondents indicated that it is difficult for newcomers to obtain employment
 - Lack of good job – high turnover and mobility
4. Environment factors:
 - Spreading out in a vast area, weather in Winter, and lack of public transportation
5. Four most cited barriers:
 1. Language
 2. Finding affordable housing and/or a job
 3. Confusion about where to get help
 4. Lack of local social connections



Settlement Services for CIC Eligible PR

Offered >50%	To be expanded >50%	Needed >25%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • help with daily life 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • language training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • services for men
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cultural events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • childcare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • language training
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • language training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • services for women 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • foreign credentials recognition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • help finding housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mental health services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • job specific language training
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • help finding a job 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cultural events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information & orientation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • services for seniors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • help finding a job 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transportation supports
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • services for women 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • services for youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specialized literacy services for grade 12 students and adults
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • social inclusion and integration support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • legal support/referrals 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • needs assessment & referrals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information & orientation 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information & orientation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • social inclusion & integration support 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • services for seniors 	



CIC Ineligible Newcomers

70% of respondents reported following needs of TFW, Int Students, Refugee claimants and Naturalized citizens:

Settlement	Economic	Social
Needs assessment and referral	Help finding a job	Childcare
Information and orientation	Educational upgrading	Cultural Events
Greeting upon arrival/initial reception	Recognition of foreign credentials	Social inclusion/ integration support
Interpretation services	Investment opportunities	Legal support/referral
Language assessment	Job-specific language training	Health Services
Language training	Help setting up a business	Mental Health Services
Help finding housing	Financial supports	Recreational services
Help with daily life	Occupational mentorship and networking	Services for seniors
Transportation support		Services for women
		Services for youth



Organizational Capacity (>50%)

Has adequate current capacity:	Currently lacks adequate capacity:	Will require additional future capacity:
-communicate with stakeholders	-financial support from government sources to maintain current services	-financial support from government sources to maintain current services
-create governing & strategic plan	-financial support from nongovernmental sources to maintain current services	-financial support from nongovernmental sources to maintain current services
-staff skills for delivery & maintenance of services	-mobilize community to support newcomers	-mobilize community to support newcomers
-meet reporting requirements	-provide services in both official languages	-staff skills for delivery & maintenance of services
-staff to provide services	-coordinate services with other SPOs	-create governing/strategic plan
		-staff to provide services
		-communicate with stakeholders
		-coordinate services with other SPOs

Feedback: Lack of core funding to support strategic and systematic planning.



Organizational planning and tracking

In our community...	Yes, internally		Yes, jointly with other SPOs		No		Don't know		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Our services for newcomers are guided by a strategic plan.	17	39.5	19	44.2	14	32.6	1	2.3	43
We regularly assesses the service needs of newcomers.	20	47.6	23	54.8	9	21.4	0	0.0	42
We have an annual report on settlement achievements.	7	16.3	4	9.3	22	51.2	10	23.3	43



Community Partnerships

1. Partnership with other SPOs are common particularly due to the previous Welcoming Community Initiative:
 1. 95.1% for services
 2. 85.4% for welcoming activities
 3. 75.6% for offering integration supports
 4. At least 75% with schools/school boards; umbrella organizations; businesses; public libraries; labour market services
 5. Strong desire
 1. To work with employers who are unwilling to take time to attend meetings
 2. Reactivate and expand previous WC initiative
 3. Organic partnership instead of formal and micromanaged process (or LIP)



Rural Uniqueness

1. Similar discriminatory conditions and practice: foreign credential, language and racial discrimination, lack of social connections, service and resource ...
2. Unique to Rural communities
 1. *Geographic challenges*: newcomers widespread, lack of public transport, weather, concentration of services
 2. *Unfamiliar encounter*: influx of ethno-racial newcomers to ethno-racial homogeneous community, intensifying discriminatory practice
 3. *Small agencies*: multiple needs with limited programming and resource, blurred professional boundary
 4. *Economic driven*: low skills jobs, economic cycle fluctuation, opposite trend of economy and housing cost, high turnover
 5. *Rigid eligibility* for increasing number of temporary residents and secondary migrants (naturalized citizens)



Suggestions:

1. Flexible and contextualized funding model and service eligibility
 1. Creative and flexible service delivery model
 2. Organic partnership model
 3. Special services for non-eligible newcomers
2. Funding to support welcoming initiative that can bring people together
3. Further study on the short- and long-term impacts of economic driven increase of newcomers in rural communities



Thank You

Acknowledgement:

1. Provincial Panel: Lucy Swib, Tiana Solares, Dominic Fung, Vicky Chiu, Lynn Moran, Alex Kang.
2. Special thanks to
 1. Jennifer Basu for conducting the telephone survey.
 2. Helen Galatsanou and Rachael Pettigrew of IRD for supporting data collection and analysis processes
 3. All the respondents and particularly those who also spent time to provide feedback to our community reports.

