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Executive Summary

Introduction

Canada can be considered an ethnocultural country, as indicated by its newcomer population, ethnic identities, visible minority populations, linguistic characteristics, and religious diversity (Statistics Canada, 2017a, paras. 1-7). According to the most recent statistics, newcomers represent 21.9% of the total Canadian population, and this number is expected to increase by at least 2.5% in the next two decades (Statistics Canada, 2017a, para. 2). While current Canadian immigration policies appear to support balanced immigration levels and foster a positive attitude toward newcomers, there are immigrants and refugees with histories of trauma, comprised health, limited education and low literacy, culture shock, difficulty accessing integration services, and language barriers, who struggle to integrate into Canadian society. The focus of this study is the Victoria Immigrant and Refugee Centre Society (VIRCS) on Vancouver Island. VIRCS is a non-profit organization with the mission, “To assist in the settlement and adjustment of immigrants and refugees in Canada and to provide services designed to increase the newcomer’s participation in Canadian society,” (VIRCS, n. d., Welcome to VIRCS).

VIRCS offers the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program (NWSP), which employs an integrated service-delivery model to help newcomers who face multiple barriers to settlement and integration. The NWSP is premised on the wraparound approach, wherein people from the client’s life work together, coordinate activities, and blend their perspectives of the client’s situation to determine an action plan that will meet the client’s needs and help accomplish their goals. The primary purpose of wraparound is to help the client take the lead in creating personalized goals and developing individualized steps that will help achieve desired outcomes (Wrap Canada, 2013, para. 1). While wraparound has been widely practiced in child welfare, youth justice, and issues of mental health across Canada, this practice is new to immigration settlement; therefore, there is limited evidence to support the effectiveness of this approach in the settlement sector (Jonquil Eyre Consulting, 2009, p. 6). This study was centred on examining how effectively the NWSP has accomplished its objectives through the implementation of the wraparound approach. The findings of this research address a knowledge gap by highlighting opportunities for improvement and exploring important wraparound success indicators that could enhance outcomes for newcomers nationwide.

Methodology and Methods

This research study employed an exploratory, mixed-methods research design to answer the main research question:

To what extent, if any, does VIRCS’ NWSP effectively help vulnerable newcomers navigate multiple barriers to social integration and immigration settlement?

Secondary research questions included:
- What is the current state of VIRCS’ NWSP?
- What aspects of the Program are working well?
- What aspects of the Program can be improved?
- What are immediate, short-term recommendations for improvement and additional, long-term recommendations for improvement?
- How can changes be implemented in consideration of monetary funds, human resources, and time?

This study performed an impact evaluation consisting of process and outcome questions to determine the NWSP’s effectiveness in achieving its ultimate goals, while assessing whether program activities have been implemented correctly to result in desirable outputs.

Upon receiving approval from the Human Research Ethics Board at the University of Victoria, data collection occurred between March and May of 2019 through two concurrent methods: (1) quantitative surveys and (2)
qualitative semi-structured, open-ended interviews. The evaluation survey and interview guides were designed based on five wraparound success indicators noted in the literature: (1) goal attainment; (2) client resilience; (3) wraparound fidelity; (4) working alliance; and (5) overall client satisfaction. There were three populations of interest: (1) Group 1: Current NWSP Clients; (2) Group 2: Former NWSP Clients; and (3) Group 3: The Settlement Team, also known as program administrators.

The survey was administered to current and former NWSP clients and consisted of 42 questions that were divided into six sections: (1) the current state of the NWSP; (2) clients’ experience with the Program; (3) clients’ goal achievement through the Program; (4) clients’ satisfaction with the Program; (5) suggestions for improvement; and (6) demographic information. There were two separate interview guides administered. One interview guide was distributed to current and former NWSP clients, and the other interview guide was administered to VIRCS’ Settlement Team. The interview guide for current and former NWSP clients consisted of 16 questions and was divided into two sections: (1) certain survey questions explored in further detail, and (2) demographic information, albeit participants were not obligated to reveal their demographic information. The interview guide for the Settlement Team introduced seven questions that explored participants’ perceptions of the NWSP in relation to client satisfaction, funding, resources, working alliance, and the Program’s ability to help achieve its goals.

**Key Findings**

The data collection methods resulted in 40 surveys and 11 interviews.

**SURVEY FINDINGS**

In total, 40 NWSP clients participated in the survey; 29 of the participants (72.5%) were enrolled in the NWSP at the time of data collection and 11 of the participants (27.5%) were former clients. Only 36 participants provided their gender and age, while four preferred not to disclose this information. In total, 61.1% (n=22) of participants identified as female and 38.9% (n=14) identified as male. The age of survey respondents ranged between 23 and 87 years. The average age was 42 years. Of the 33 survey respondents who answered the immigration status question, 87.9% (n=30) stated that they were permanent residents, 9.1% (n=3) reported temporary resident status (i.e. student or work visa), and 3% (n=2) stated that they were refugees or protected persons. In total, 15 different countries of origin were recorded: 47.2% (n=17) originated from China and 8.3% (n=3) originated from Syria. Other countries of origin included: Algeria, Barbados, England, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Morocco, the Philippines, Senegal, Vietnam, and Rwanda. Only 35 participants provided their ethnicity. The three ethnicities reported were Asian, Black/African, and Middle Eastern. Of the 35 participants who provided their ethnicity, 66.7% (n=26) identified as Asian, 25% (n=10) identified as Black/African, and 8% (n=3) identified as Middle Eastern.

On average, participants cited approximately three barriers to settlement and integration. The most common barriers to settlement and integration were difficulty speaking English and challenges finding a suitable job. Specifically, 51.3% (n=20) of participants stated that they cannot speak English well and 48.7% (n=19) stated that they are having a hard time finding a job. Moreover, 53.8% (n=21) of participants stated that they do not earn enough money to support themselves. In addition, 12.8% (n=5) of participants cited that they feel discriminated against, and 28.2% (n=11) explained that they feel compelled to change who they are to fit into Canadian society. Furthermore, 28.2% (n=11) of participants stated that their education is not recognized in the workplace, and 5.1% (n=2) stated that difficult experiences in their country of origin were preventing them from properly settling into Canada. Other barriers cited were issues with mental health and poor experiences with immigration services. Of the 36 participants who shared their settlement goals, 41.5% (n=15) stated that they were hoping to find a job, 27.5% (n=10) wished to build a social network, and 25% (n=9) wanted to learn English. In addition, 17.5% (n=6) of participants wished to acquire their permanent residency or their Canadian citizenship.
The average level of goal attainment was 64.8%. Goal attainment has been noted as one of the most common predictors of wraparound effectiveness. Specifically, the literature revealed that having individualized goal setting and monitoring processes in place, a high level of fidelity to the four phases and ten principles of the wraparound approach, and highly trained case managers who can adequately assess and identify clients’ needs are essential in ensuring successful goal attainment among clients. Over half of the participants stated that the NWSP has helped them learn the Canadian banking system, go to school or acquire recognition for their foreign education documents, find a suitable job, address issues with their immigration documents, acquire appropriate medical documents, and find suitable housing. Of the 40 survey respondents, 82.5% (n=33) of participants stated that their circumstances have improved since starting the Program, and 52.5% (n=21) believed the NWSP will effectively help them meet their needs. The average level of client resilience was 85%. Wraparound evaluations have viewed resilience as a process instead of a personality trait, as it involves the interplay between the individual, family, community, and society with strong temporal, cultural, and individual meanings attached. Over three-quarters of the participants believed that their wraparound plan will help them settle into Canada and reported that their circumstances have improved since starting the NWSP. For example, participants stated that the NWSP has helped them feel hopeful about the future, participate in programs and activities in their neighbourhood, and practice their culture, religion, values, and beliefs.

The average level of wraparound fidelity was 75.3%. According to the literature, this is an average score amongst most wraparound approaches. Measuring fidelity determines how adequately the wraparound process has been delivered in practice compared to its original specification or design. Of the 40 survey respondents, 87.5% (n=35) met with a case manager at the beginning of the Program to discuss their needs. In addition, participants with a wraparound plan reported better relationships with their wraparound team and held more positive perceptions regarding their integration process than participants without a wraparound plan. The average level of working alliance was 69.3%. Working alliance is often defined as the relationship between a client and the professional or natural supports available, referred to as the client’s wraparound team (Hatcher & Gillapsy, 2006, p. 12). It is a means by which the client and the team hope to engage with each other and effect beneficial change in the client. Of the 40 survey respondents, 85% (n=34) stated that they are happy with their wraparound team and believed that their wraparound team is respectful of their culture, ethnicity, and values; 65% (n=26) claimed that their wraparound team is understanding of their needs; 26.9% (n=4) noted that their favourite part about the NWSP is their case manager; and 57.5% (n=23) stated that some members of their wraparound team were natural supports, such as friends and family.

The average level of client satisfaction was 82.5%. The literature has found that clients who feel involved in the development of their wraparound plan and share meaningful relationships with their wraparound team frequent the wraparound program more often, thereby exhibiting higher levels of satisfaction. Accordingly, 87.5% (n=35) of survey respondents reported feeling satisfied with the NWSP, and those with a wraparound plan appeared more satisfied with the Program than participants without a wraparound plan. Over half of the participants also stated that the Program has helped meet their needs. In addition, 80% (n=32) of participants reported feeling satisfied with the progress they have made since stating the Program, and 97.1% (n=34) who were satisfied reported meeting with their case manager at least once a month. Of the 16 participants who disclosed their favourite part about the NWSP, 30.8% (n=6) stated that the Program is goal oriented; 30.8% (n=6) stated that the Program has a welcoming and supportive environment; and 26.9% (n=4) noted that the Program has dedicated case managers. Of the 26 participants who provided suggestions for improvement, 46% (n=12) discussed the need to provide more information about systems of operation in Canada; 27% (n=7) suggested hosting more events and activities; and 27% (n=7) mentioned the need for more resources.

**Interview Findings**

Interview findings have been divided into two parts: (1) Findings from Groups 1 and 2 Interviews and (2) Findings from Group 3 Interviews. In total, five themes emerged from the interviews conducted with current and former clients: (1) Immigration History; (2) Reasons for Accessing the NWSP; (3) Internal Success Factors for Integration and Settlement; (3) Strengths of the NWSP; and (5) Opportunities for Improvement. Of the five interview participants, four immigrated to Canada on temporary visas. Of these four participants, three have remained in Canada due to traumatic circumstances, such as becoming a stateless person, conflict with
immigration services, or being accused of a crime. With respect to accessing VIRCS, 80% (n=4) noted issues with immigration documents as the reason for approaching the organization; 60% (n=3) stated that they were seeking to learn English or searching for employment and housing; and 80% (n=4) mentioned receiving an external recommendation. Reciprocity and resilience were common behavioural traits among interview participants that helped them manage barriers to settlement and integration. Factors that participants perceived as strengths of the NWSP include: (1) creating a sense of belonging; (2) providing diverse and flexible services; (3) exhibiting strong working alliance and having culturally competent case managers; (4) being goal-oriented; and (5) generating high levels of overall satisfaction among clients. The two suggestions for improvement that derived from the interview findings were a need for greater variety of service providers and stronger adherence to wraparound fidelity.

While demographic data was not collected among the Settlement Team to protect their identity, five additional themes derived from these findings: (1) Immigration Challenges; (2) Fidelity to the Wraparound Process; (3) Client Satisfaction; (4) Strengths of the NWSP; and (5) Opportunities for Improvement. The most notable challenges that derived from these findings include: (1) Cultural Differences; (2) Family Separation; and (3) Limited Resources in the Broader Community. According to the interview findings, cultural differences could lead to depression among clients and prevent job retention. Family separation, coupled with Canada’s individualistic nature, could raise barriers to settlement and integration by making newcomers feel isolated. Limited resources in the broader community, including housing and daycare, could also pose difficulties to settlement and integration. Wraparound fidelity questions revealed that the NWSP is client-centred, outcome-based, and knowledgeable of the appropriate components regarding the wraparound process. Interview participants often mentioned placing the client at the centre as one of the most important aspects of the NWSP. In addition, participants noted that clients would often return to share the accomplishments the NWSP has helped them achieve. Most participants had some awareness of wraparound theory; however, many admitted that the NWSP does not strictly adhere to these formal processes due to its adaptive and flexible nature.

Client satisfaction results were similar to findings derived from the surveys and interviews with Groups 1 and 2, as all six of the participants noted that their clients seemed very satisfied with the Program. Common strengths that were cited with respect to the NWSP include: (1) diverse and flexible services; (2) high levels of cultural competence; (3) passionate service providers; and (4) strong working alliance. Opportunities for improvement from a service provider perspective included: (1) enhanced activities to help release stress among staff; (2) improved retention techniques; (3) more structured training and orientation; and (4) enhanced funds and resources. While participants noted that VIRCS offers extensive training sessions for staff on dispute resolution and debriefing, they cited the need for more team-building activities, training focused on stress management, and greater support for self-care. Participants explained that there are formal training sessions available throughout B.C. regarding the wraparound approach; however, there did not appear to be any formal trainings administered at VIRCS. Common citations of staff turnover reveal a potential opportunity for VIRCS to improve its retention techniques through hiring more employees and increasing wages, albeit this would require additional funding and resources. Participants often mentioned that they try to make the most of the resources they have available. Nevertheless, the need for more funding to implement a greater variety of workshops, hire more case managers, increase the wages of case managers, and offer formalized training were often mentioned among interview participants.

**Recommendations**

Given the findings, it can be argued that the NWSP is quite effective in delivering its services. However, there remain opportunities for improvement within the Program. This study has produced three recommendations that VIRCS could explore between 2020 and 2023 in order to maintain effectiveness and further improve the experiences and outcomes of vulnerable newcomers: (1) Design and implement an evaluation framework for the NWSP between 2020 and 2021; (2) Establish an employee recruitment and retention strategy between 2020 and 2022; and (3) Create a diversified funding stream for the NWSP between 2020 and 2023.
The first recommendation suggests using the findings of this study to design an evaluation framework that could be implemented on an annual basis in order to monitor the progress of the NWSP. Given that the information derived from this study is readily available, this recommendation would be quite plausible within the next year. A potential evaluation framework has been developed for VIRCS in Appendix E. The second recommendation is to establish a retention and recruitment strategy premised on ensuring that current case managers enjoy a healthy work environment, while cultural competencies and sound knowledge of the wraparound approach are exhibited in future employees. This recommendation would require attentive organization and dedicated human resources.

The third recommendation suggests the establishment of a diversified funding stream for the NWSP. The interview findings have revealed that case managers can face roadblocks when attempting to help clients reach their goals due to limited resources within the Program and in the broader community. The interview findings also revealed that job insecurity could lead to unnecessary stress among employees, which may affect case manager’s ability to remain dedicated and devoted to their clients, thereby impacting the effectiveness of service delivery. Consequently, a contributor to program effectiveness may be the implementation of a diversified funding stream, wherein the organization receives funds from a variety of entities to support the NWSP, instead of solely being funded by one source.

Overall, the findings of this study address some of the existing knowledge gaps regarding the effectiveness of the wraparound approach in settlement and integration, as they provide reliable evidence highlighting the benefits that a wraparound approach can have upon vulnerable newcomers. Nevertheless, this project exhibits a number of limitations that could be explored in future research. First, the sample used to determine effectiveness was not representative of the entire population classified as vulnerable immigrants and refugees. Consequently, the results of this study cannot be generalized to all immigrants and refugees, thereby preventing society from adequately knowing the effectiveness of the NWSP among this population in Greater Victoria. Second, interviews were only conducted with five enrolled clients, without any former clients volunteering to participate in the interview. A greater number of participants would have provided deeper insights regarding the current state of the NWSP. Third, the findings of this study are limited to the NWSP, although there are additional wraparound approaches undertaken across the Canadian immigration and refugee settlement sector. Fourth, this study only evaluated the NWSP’s effectiveness based on tailored measures influenced by the literature. However, there are additional reliable measures to test wraparound effectiveness.

Ultimately, the wraparound approach is deserving of future research to incorporate this practice into Canada’s immigration and settlement system in order to enhance the lives of fellow global citizens who deemed Canada worthy of their new home. It is recommended that Canadian settlement organizations study the effectiveness of this integrated service-delivery model by consulting a representative sample of the broader immigrant and refugee population, comparison groups, expert interviews, and robust evaluation tools. While there have been efforts to address immigration barriers, the Honourable Ahmed Hussen, Minister of Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada (IRCC), has publicly acknowledged that, “We could do better.”
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**Glossary**

**Barriers** – barriers to immigration settlement and integration include: insufficient knowledge of Canada’s official languages (English and French); lack of information about employment opportunities; discrimination by the dominant society derived from differences, biases, and negative conceptions; internal barriers (i.e. social, cultural, and religious norms originating from within the respective ethnic minority); and institutional barriers (i.e. citizenship or legal restrictions). Other barriers may include poverty; lack of legal documents; lack of self-confidence to apply for employment; non-recognition of foreign educational documents; unwillingness to work; trauma after spells in refugee camps; lack of experience in the host country’s social context; and lack of interest in integration (Trbola & Rákoczyová, 2011, pp. 97-98).

**Effective** – the degree to which the objectives of VIRCS’ NWSP are achieved. According to the evaluation literature regarding wrapararound approaches, determinants of effectiveness include: client goal achievement; high levels of client resilience; social determinants of health (i.e. income and social status; social support networks; education; employment/working conditions; social environments; physical environments; personal health practices, and coping skills); fidelity of the wraparound process; constructive working alliance between clients and case workers; and high levels of client satisfaction with the overall wraparound process.

**Immigration Settlement** – a process or a continuum of activities that a new immigrant/refugee experiences upon arrival in a new country. This process includes the stages of adjustment, adaptation, and integration. Adjustment is about acclimatization and getting used to the new culture, language, people and environment, or coping with the situation (Shields, Drolet, & Valenzuela, 2016, p. 5). Adaptation is about learning and managing the situation without a great deal of help (Shields *et al.*, 2016, p. 5). Integration is about actively participating, getting involved, and contributing as a citizen of a new country (Shields *et al.*, 2016, p. 5).

**Newcomer(s)** – the general term VIRCS uses for the various classes of immigrants and refugees.

**Social Integration** – developing a sense of belonging to the host society. This often involves accepting and acting according to that society's values and norms and building the social capital necessary by the host country's institutions (Laurentsyeva & Venturini, 2017, p. 285). Social integration is only feasible once newcomers are accepted as members of society. Such mutual recognition, apart from improving individual well-being, leads to better social cohesion and has considerable economic implications, from the provision of public goods and redistribution to teamwork and productivity in the workplace (Laurentsyeva & Venturini, 2017, p. 285).

**Vulnerable Immigrants** – VIRCS identifies vulnerable immigrants through IRCC’s Eligibility Assessment Tool. According to this resource, vulnerable immigrants include individuals experiencing one or more of the following: histories of trauma; comprised health; limited education and low literacy; culture shock; difficulty accessing services to integrate; and/or a lack of English skills (VIRCS, 2015, p. 5).

**Case Manager/Wraparound Coordinator** – highly trained professional who starts the wraparound process by helping wraparound clients identify immediate safety needs and assists them in developing both proactive and reactive safety plans to address them. From there, the case manager helps the client identify their goals or their hopes and dreams, their strengths, their family culture, and their day to day needs. The case manager ensures that all critical needs are addressed by asking about the person’s needs in each area or domain of their life (i.e. work, school, relationships, social and recreation, etc.). The case manager then guides the client in the identification of friends, extended family members, and service providers who they want to be on their team. Both formal service providers and natural or informal support people have a place on the team (Debicki, 2011, p. 1). While the literature often refers to these individuals as wraparound coordinators, VIRCS refers to these individuals as case managers.
Wraparound Plan – a dynamic document that describes the client, the team, and the work to be undertaken to meet the client’s needs and achieve their long-term vision. The plan is flexible and adaptable, as it changes over time to meet the client’s various needs (Debicki, 2011, p. 1).

Wraparound Process – an innovative approach by which a community can work together to support those individuals in the community who are dealing with multiple, complex problems to have their needs addressed and have a better life on a daily basis. It does this by mobilizing the community, acquiring the support of local system partnerships, and implementing the wraparound planning process one client at a time. There are four key areas that must be addressed to ensure the success of this approach in a community:

1. The community and the system partnership in that community work together toward a common end with each client.
2. Case managers require good clinical teaching or clinical coaching. Only then can case managers ensure that they are implementing the process to a level of high fidelity.
3. Clients must be connected to community groups to help them reconnect with positive social networks so that they can rebuild a supportive safety net for themselves.
4. People implementing this planning process must see their role as both case manager and educator; they should use every opportunity possible to educate the participants how, why, and the different ways to do their own wraparound planning (Debicki, 2011, pp. 1-2).

Wraparound Principles – A set of 10 statements that defines the wraparound philosophy and guides the activities of the wraparound process (see Appendix A).

Wraparound Team – surrounds clients with a support team of natural, formal, and informal supports. This support team is chosen by the client. The team works together to help the client plan their steps forward and build strategies to overcome barriers to success in order to reach their goals. This team of people with the client at the centre is brought together quickly, often (but not always) within the first month of service. The case manager then guides the team through a highly structured but very flexible planning process. The team meets frequently, at least once a month, to review the success of the plan. After identifying what has worked and what has not, the team brainstorms and strategizes as necessary and continues to build on that plan at the direction of the client (Debicki, 2011, p. 1).
1.0 Introduction

Canada can be considered an ethnocultural country as indicated by its newcomer population, ethnic identities, visible minority populations, linguistic characteristics, and religious diversity (Statistics Canada, 2017a, paras. 1-7). According to the most recent statistics, newcomers represent 21.9% of the total Canadian population (Statistics Canada, 2017a, para. 2). The diversity of Canada’s population is expected to continue to increase in the next two decades due to immigration, especially in large metropolitan cities, such as Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver. Statistics Canada (2017b) projects that by 2031, newcomers will represent between 24.5% and 30% of the population, while 34.7% to 39.9% of the working age population will belong to a visible minority group, compared to 19.6% in 2016 (para. 7).

Immigration has been an important part of the Canadian federal government’s agenda for many reasons because it can offset demographic developments, including low fertility rates, an aging population, a growing elderly dependency ratio, and a shrinking labour force (Canada Immigration, 2018a, para. 10). Between 2016 and 2017, international students and visitors contributed over $31 billion to the Canadian economy, while international migration accounted for 80% of Canada’s population growth between 2017 and 2018 (Hussen, 2018, p. 3). In addition, studies have revealed that the children of newcomers outperform their Canadian peers in high-school and university graduation rates (Canada Immigration, 2018b, Contribution of Immigrant Children). Newcomers are also more likely to start their own businesses than their Canadian-born counterparts, which is a key component of economic growth (Canada Immigration, 2018a, para. 12). In 2017, economic immigrants residing in Canada for at least five years exceeded Canadian average earnings by 6% and were 15% to 24% more likely to be working than Canadian-born residents (Hussen, 2018, p. 3).

While current Canadian immigration policies appear to support balanced immigration levels and foster a positive attitude toward newcomers, some immigrants and refugees continue to struggle with successful integration into Canadian society. Statistics Canada’s 2002 Ethnic Diversity Survey revealed that 24% of visible minorities felt out of place in Canada due to their ethnicity, culture, race, skin colour, language, accent, or religion, compared to 8% of their Caucasian counterparts (Statistics Canada, 2003, p. 16). In addition, approximately 20% of visible minorities experienced discrimination or unfair treatment in the previous five years, as opposed to 5% of Caucasians (Statistics Canada, 2003, p. 19). The Ethnic Diversity Survey further indicated that newcomers with close ties to their ethnic or cultural identity report a strong sense of belonging to this group and participate less in activities offered within Canada, including voting and civic engagement (Statistics Canada, 2003, p. 23). Recent newcomers also have higher levels of poverty and unemployment, compared to the Canadian-born population (Government of Canada, 2017, pp. 15-16). According to Reitz (2010), these experiences can lead to a sense of exclusion and detachment from Canadian society (para. 9).

Given these challenges, there are various organizations that aim to help the successful integration of newcomers into Canadian society through identifying settlement barriers and aiming to address their root causes. The focus of this capstone project is the Victoria Immigrant and Refugee Centre Society (VIRCS) in British Columbia (B.C.), which offers a Newcomer Wraparound Support Program (NWSP) for vulnerable immigrant populations to aid their successful integration into Greater Victoria. This report presents the findings and analysis of an exploratory program evaluation, wherein surveys and interviews were conducted with current and former NWSP clients and program administrators to uncover what aspects of the NWSP are working well, identify any gaps, and provide recommendations for improvement.

1 While this survey was conducted 16 years ago, it is one of the only national surveys that inquiries about ethnic diversity in Canada.
1.1 Background

THE VICTORIA IMMIGRANT AND REFUGEE CENTRE SOCIETY (VIRCS)

VIRCS was founded in November of 1989 by three former refugees, and is a registered, non-profit organization funded by the provincial government of B.C., the federal government of Canada, several foundations, fundraising events, corporate sponsors, and private donations (VIRCS, n. d., About). The organization’s mission is, “To assist in the settlement and adjustment of immigrants and refugees in Canada and to provide services designed to increase newcomers’ participation in Canadian society by helping them overcome barriers” (VIRCS, n. d., Welcome to VIRCS). Accordingly, VIRCS is comprised of diverse, multicultural employees who help an average of 3,000 immigrants, refugees, new Canadian citizens, and visible minorities to adapt into new lives in Greater Victoria on an annual basis.

VIRCS has two main departments: the Settlement Department and the Administration Department. The Settlement Department comprises of the NWSP, formerly known as the Vulnerable Immigrants Population Program, the B.C. Settlement and Integration Services Program, the Enable Youth Program, and Child Mining. The Administration Department comprises of the Volunteer Program, the ESL (English as a Second Language) Program, the Pathways 2 Professions and Trades Program, and the B.C. Employment Program, which has recently come to an end (A. Okot-Ochen, personal communication, March 25, 2019). Various services provided through these programs include language training, employment counselling, skills training and job placement, individual and family counselling, interpretation and translation, information and referral, legal information, and health care services (VIRCS, n. d., Administration). These services operate in accordance with an integrated service delivery model. As such, VIRCS has developed positive relationships with other organizations, service providers, the local business community, and the community at large in order to connect newcomers with appropriate community resources that could help fulfill clients’ individual needs (VIRCS, n. d., About).

THE NEWCOMER WRAPAROUND SUPPORT PROGRAM (NWSP)

The NWSP is the main program operated through VIRCS’ Settlement Department. The NWSP was established in 2012 and originally funded by the Government of B.C. under the Ministry of Jobs, Trade and Technology until 2014. In 2014, responsibility for the Program was transferred to the federal government of Canada under Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada (IRCC). The Program is currently funded through IRCC, which requires an annual report of deliverables to determine funding for the next fiscal year. The approximate operating budget for the Program is $80,000.00 per three month-term. This sum is further divided into an estimated $1,750.00 per individual client, a total of $700.00 for the professional development of all staff, and a total of $300.00 for travel (A. Okot-Ochen, personal communication, March 25, 2019).

The NWSP is administered by the Settlement Team. The Settlement Team is led by the Director of Settlement Services, followed by an intake coordinator, and several case managers. The intake coordinator is responsible for assessing the needs of each client and pairing them with the case manager who is best suited for the respective client’s unique needs. Case managers are responsible for wrapping the client with individualized services intended to help navigate overwhelming or complex barriers to settlement and integration in Greater Victoria. Examples of settlement services include: helping newcomers with community connections and participation; overcoming language barriers; finding support for relational, emotional, and spiritual needs; maintaining healthy relationships; connecting with legal advocates; and achieving basic financial, employment, housing, and social service needs (VIRCS, n. d., Settlement).

To qualify for the NWSP, newcomers must be classified as Convention Refugees, Refugee Claimants, Protected Persons, or Permanent Residents. The NWSP is primarily focused on vulnerable immigrant populations, as the Program’s mandate is, “To serve the most high-needs newcomer children, youth, adults, families, and seniors in the Greater Victoria Area...” (VIRCS, 2015, p. 3). The vulnerability of prospective clients is determined using IRCC’s Eligibility Assessment Tool. Individuals with histories of trauma,
comprised health, limited education and low literacy, culture shock, difficulty accessing integration services, and/or a lack of English skills are generally deemed most vulnerable (VIRCS, 2015, p. 5). The wraparound approach is incorporated into the provided services via gathering and coordinating around a person or family in order to help them succeed.

**Overview of the Wraparound Approach**

Wraparound is a planning process that follows a series of steps to help clients realize their hopes and dreams (Miles, Bruns, Osher, Walker, & National Wraparound Initiative Advisory Group, 2019, p. 4). The client may be one individual or a group of individuals. With the help of one or more trained professionals, people from the client’s life work together, coordinate activities, and blend their perspectives of the client’s situation to determine an action plan that will meet the client’s needs and help accomplish their goals. The primary purpose of wraparound is to help the client take the lead in creating personalized goals and developing individualized steps that will help achieve desired outcomes.

Basic elements of wraparound include a case manager, a wraparound team, and a wraparound plan. The case manager works collaboratively with the client to develop an individualized wraparound plan intended to effectively address the client’s needs on a daily basis (Wrap Canada, 2013, para. 1). The wraparound team is created with the help of the case manager and consists of approximately three to ten individuals who work together to build the individualized wraparound plan. The team can consist of formal supports, such as community organizations, and informal supports, such as family members and friends. The wraparound plan represents the foundation of the client’s strengths and is adapted to the client’s unique needs. The wraparound team convenes frequently to measure the plan’s components against relevant indicators of success. Plan components and strategies are revised when outcomes are not being achieved. The goal of the wraparound plan is to help people regain control of their lives and prevent them from feeling helpless or powerless within society (Wrap Canada, 2013, para. 3).

Wraparound began in North America in the 1970s. The initiative was first introduced by John Brown, a Canadian who developed some of the first small group homes as an alternative to large facilities or institutions for youth with emotional problems (Jonquil Eyre Consulting, 2009, p. 6). These group homes focused on providing needs-based, individual services without judgement. John D. Burchard further developed the wraparound approach in the 1980s. Burchard was one of the first researchers to take an interest in the model introduced by Brown and is recognized as a pioneer of the wraparound process for children experiencing serious mental health problems (Jonquil Eyre Consulting, 2009, p. 6).

Since the introduction of the wraparound approach, the initiative has been adapted in various service delivery models, most notably Kaleidoscope in Chicago, the Alaska Youth Initiative, and Project Wraparound in Vermont. Critical first descriptions of the approach were provided by VanDenBerg and Grealish (1996) and Godlman (1999), presenting elements and practice principles that spanned activity at the team, organizational, and system levels (as cited in Bruns, Walker, & National Wraparound Advisory Group, 2008, p. 1). Despite these descriptions of the initiative, experts in the field have recognized that wraparound may differ from one community to another due to its grassroots development and individualized nature. There may also be different types of case managers. However, according to the American National Wraparound Initiative, wraparound should always be driven by ten principles, including family voice and choice, natural supports, and collaboration, and follow four basic phases, including: (1) engagement, support, and team preparation; (2) initial plan development; (3) implementation; and (4) transition (Miles et al., 2019, p. 4). These principles and phases are summarized in Appendix A.

Despite its wide implementation and documentation of successful use in various communities, there is consensus among experts in the field that more rigorous evaluation is needed to fully understand the effectiveness of wraparound. This concern has become the fundamental basis for this capstone project.
### 1.2 Defining the Problem

While wraparound has been widely practiced in child welfare, youth justice, and issues of mental health across Canada, this practice is new to immigration settlement (Jonquil Eyre Consulting, 2009, p. 6). VIRCS’ Director of Immigration Settlement Services has expressed general concerns about limited evidence supporting the effectiveness of the wraparound approach, as the application of wraparound in immigration settlement is minimal. In addition to limited information in the literature, VIRCS has not developed or implemented an evaluation framework to examine whether the NWSP is achieving its desired results of helping newcomers successfully navigate barriers to integration. Consequently, the organization has not been able to evaluate whether the NWSP is achieving the same positive results noted in other fields. Furthermore, while the successful application of the wraparound approach should theoretically lead to successful outcomes and has been proven to help clients with their unique needs in various applications of the practice, VIRCS has expressed that the NWSP may cause some clients, particularly those with multiple barriers to integration and settlement, to become dependent on the services offered. This concern raises the risk of reverting to previous integration challenges or facing new obstacles once clients complete the final transition phase of the Program.

Ultimately, data collection and analysis are necessary to determine the impacts of this service on highly vulnerable immigrant populations in Greater Victoria. In addition, program evaluation has the potential to identify areas of the wraparound approach that are ineffective within immigration settlement and uncover the need for additional resources required to ensure that the intended goals of the NWSP can successfully be achieved. Examining the effectiveness of wraparound approaches to immigration settlement may also discover opportunities for improvement and explore smart practices to social integration and settlement that could contribute to positive outcomes for highly vulnerable immigrant populations nationwide.

### 1.3 Project Objectives and Research Question(s)

This program evaluation sought to answer the following research question:

To what extent, if any, does VIRCS’ NWSP effectively help vulnerable newcomers navigate multiple barriers to social integration and immigration settlement?

The main terms that were used in the research question have been defined in the Glossary of this report.

The following secondary questions have also been explored:

- What is the current state of VIRCS’ NWSP?
- What aspects of the Program are working well?
- What aspects of the Program can be improved?
- What are immediate, short-term recommendations for improvement and additional, long-term recommendations for improvement?
- How can changes be implemented in consideration of monetary funds, human resources, and time?

The findings of this project have been designed to further VIRCS’ understanding of how to effectively use the wraparound process to build the capacity of vulnerable immigrants and refugees to manage multiple, complex, and ongoing barriers to immigration settlement and integration.

### 1.4 Project Client and Deliverables

The client for this project is VIRCS’ Director of Settlement Services, who is responsible for the successful implementation and administration of the NWSP. In support of the primary and secondary research questions, deliverables include:

- **Literature Review** – summary and analysis of the literature focusing on the program evaluation of services that are premised on wraparound approaches. The literature draws on a variety of academic, professional, and jurisdictional sources.
Survey and Interview Data – summary and analysis of the raw data gathered via surveys and interviews administered to current and former NWSP clients and VIRCS’ Settlement Team.

Recommendations – general recommendations flowing from the literature review, surveys, and interviews intended to assist the client with next steps.

1.5 Organization of Report

This report is divided into nine chapters with accompanying subsections. Chapter 1: Introduction begins with information regarding the importance of immigrants and refugees to Canadian society in order to provide context for this research. Subsections include background information on VIRCS, the NWSP, and the wraparound approach. A problem definition is also provided, followed by project objectives, the main research question, and secondary research questions. The chapter concludes with a brief description of the project client, project deliverables, and the organization of this report. Chapter 2: Literature Review focuses on past evaluations that have been conducted on wraparound approaches in order to provide guidance for the project and an opportunity to compare current findings with past knowledge. Five themes emerged through an extensive review of the literature: goal achievement; client resilience; fidelity of the wraparound process; working alliance; and overall client satisfaction with the wraparound approach (Debicki, Vandenakker, & Vander Vennen, 2012, pp. 11-12).

Chapter 3: Methodology and Methods provides an explanation of the methodology employed to answer the primary and secondary research questions of the project. This information is followed by a detailed explanation of the methods and tasks implemented to undertake the project. The chapter concludes with a subsection describing the data analysis of this project, followed by a subsection listing limitations and delimitations. Chapter 4: Findings – Descriptive Statistical Analysis, Chapter 5: Findings – Groups 1 and 2 Interviews, and Chapter 6: Findings – Group 3 Interviews provide a descriptive presentation of the main themes derived from the interviews and the most notable information derived from the surveys.

Chapter 7: Discussion and Analysis focuses on analyzing the key findings presented in Chapters 4, 5, and 6. The analysis has been written in a manner that directly answers the primary and secondary research questions of this capstone project. Chapter 8: Recommendations provides general recommendations flowing from the literature review, surveys, and interviews intended to assist the client with next steps. Finally, Chapter 9: Concluding Remarks summarizes each of the aforementioned chapters of this report and concludes with suggested next steps.
2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

Given that this project is centred on evaluating the effectiveness of VIRCS’ NWSP, the literature review is limited in scope to focus on past evaluations that have been conducted on wraparound approaches in order to provide guidance for the project and an opportunity to compare current findings with past knowledge.

The main databases used from the University of Victoria’s Online Library for completing the literature review include: JSTOR, Google Scholar, the Humanities Index, EBSCOhost, and the Oxford Dictionary. Search terms and phrases used include: ‘Wraparound’, ‘Wraparound Approach’, ‘Wraparound Initiative’, ‘Wraparound Model’, ‘Wraparound Program’, ‘Wraparound Services’, ‘Wraparound AND Immigration Settlement’, ‘Wraparound AND Immigration Integration’, ‘Evaluating the Effectiveness of Wraparound’, ‘Effectiveness of Wraparound in Immigration Settlement’ ‘Measuring the Success of Wraparound’ ‘Wraparound Success Factors’, ‘Adherence to Wraparound Principles’, ‘Criticisms of Wraparound’, ‘Weaknesses of Wraparound’, and ‘Criticisms/Weaknesses of Wraparound AND Recommendations for Improvement’. In brief, the search targeted wraparound approaches in immigration settlement and integration; definitions of the effectiveness of wraparound approaches; factors measuring the success of wraparound initiatives; and criticisms and weaknesses of wraparound approaches. The search also reviewed formal wraparound principles and phases and the importance of adhering to these theoretical underpinnings during program implementation. Both published and unpublished journal articles, books, conference proceedings, and reports were included in the search. A general internet search of wraparound approaches was also conducted to retrieve any sector-specific information.

Using this approach, several hundred abstracts were identified. Many of these titles were related to wraparound approaches in youth justice and child welfare, whereas evaluations regarding wraparound approaches in immigration settlement were limited. Nevertheless, the theoretical underpinnings of wraparound are the same in any type of service, given that the approach should adhere to the four phases and ten principles explained in Appendix A. As such, performance measures deemed important in one wraparound program could be translated to a different field if the wraparound approach was correctly implemented.

An extensive review of the relevant literature has revealed five common categories important to the success of wraparound initiatives that could be used as performance measures in VIRCS’ NWSP’s evaluation: goal attainment; client resilience; fidelity of the wraparound process; working alliance; and overall client satisfaction with the wraparound process. These themes are explained in detail in the following subsections.

2.2 Goal Attainment

One of the most dominant categories that emerged in the literature regarding the evaluation of various wraparound approaches to service delivery is the measure of goal attainment. Goal attainment is a theory of process and outcomes\(^2\), wherein service providers and clients have effective communication, set acceptable goals\(^3\), and work toward achieving these goals (Day, n. d., p. 2). In theory, the main purpose of any wraparound approach is to ensure that clients are capable of meeting their goals. If the wraparound process is undertaken correctly, each client should enter the service in accordance with the initiative’s four phases: (1) engagement and team preparation; (2) initial plan development; (3) plan implementation; and (4) transition. Essentially, these phases are intended to begin with analyzing the clients’ needs and introducing a process of goal setting in phases 1 and 2. Phases 3 and 4 should then proceed with monitoring progress and determining next steps for success (Bruns, Pullmann, Sather, Brinson, & Ramey, 2014, p. 310). Therefore, ensuring that

\(^2\) An outcome is what a person will have achieved when they have been successful in reaching their goal and/or how their life will be different/better when their goal is achieved (Debicki et al., 2012, Appendix 5).

\(^3\) A goal is something people want to work on so that they can achieve their hopes and dreams and be in a better place in their life at a given time in the future (Debicki et al., 2012, Appendix 5).
goal attainment is incorporated into measuring the success of a wraparound approach is justifiable, as evidenced in the following examples and broader literature.

Debicki, Vandenakker, and Vander Vennen (2012) partnered with the Shalem Mental Health Network (hereafter Shalem) in Ontario to develop and implement a multi-site, strength-based program evaluation framework of the organization’s wraparound program that is congruent with the core values and key principles of the wraparound process (p. 2). The primary purpose of this project was to further Shalem’s understanding regarding the most effective use of the wraparound process in building the capacity of children/youth and their families to deal with multiple, complex, and ongoing mental health problems (Debicki et al., 2012, p. 2). The tools used to measure outcomes included a questionnaire based on social determinants of health for adults, two resilience measures, one for youth and one for adults, a Wraparound Fidelity Index, and Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS) (Debicki et al., 2012, p. 12). The program evaluation tools were administered twice: at the onset of the wraparound process (Time 1), and a month after the start of the wraparound process (Time 2). The focus of this subsection is GAS.

While there are varied versions of GAS, Debicki and colleagues (2012) used a form of GAS in which participants decide their own goals and periodically address their progress toward these goals (p. 13; see Figure 1). This form of goal attainment measurement is consistent with wraparound’s client-centred and outcome-based nature (see Appendix A). The GAS tool was administered across three different sites. A total of eight adults completed GAS for two separate goals at Time 1 and Time 2. At Time 2, over half of the adults reported that they were “mostly there” toward achieving their first goal, while over a quarter of adults reported that they had “achieved” their first goal (Debicki et al., 2012, p. 20). In addition, over a quarter of adults reported that they were “mostly there” in achieving their second goal and just under a quarter of them reported that they had “achieved” their second goal (Debicki et al., 2012, p. 20). According to Debicki and colleagues (2012), “The fact that eight adults across three sites experienced a positive increase between Time 1 and Time 2 in two of their goal areas is a positive result for clients and a promising result with respect to the development of an effective and quantifiable [client] driven GAS process,” (p. 20).

GOAL SETTING

The Goal Is:

Start Date:

Date Accomplished By:

The following scale would be repeated for each month that the participant worked on the goal.

MONTH 1 – GOAL ATTAINMENT SCALING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting Goal</th>
<th>Partly There</th>
<th>Halfway There</th>
<th>Mostly There</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 1. GOAL ATTAINMENT SCALING
Source: Adapted from Debicki et al., 2012, Appendix 5

Debicki and colleagues (2012) have recognized that their model of GAS must be refined to better measure quantifiable results and more easily implement into the wraparound process (p. 20). However, this shortcoming is beyond the scope of this literature review. The significance of noting this study within the current report is premised on the fact that the four phases and ten principles of wraparound have been developed to ensure that clients can engage in a collaborative process that will allow their hopes and dreams to be realized. As such, Debicki and colleagues’ (2012) emphasis on having a tool that can effectively help clients measure their own goals within a wraparound approach simultaneously highlights the importance of
goal attainment to the wraparound initiative’s overall success, as their study has proven that this factor can be transformed into a quantifiable measure of wraparound program evaluations (p. 20).

A study conducted by Bruns and colleagues (2014) highlights that in addition to allowing clients to develop and monitor their own goals throughout the wraparound process, adherence to the theoretical underpinnings of wraparound is also an important factor in successful goal attainment (p. 309). Bruns and colleagues’ (2014) primary research was designed to compare the service experiences and outcomes of youth with serious emotional disorder (p. 309). The youth were assigned to two separate treatment groups: (1) a form of wraparound treatment and (2) traditional intensive case management (Bruns et al., 2014, p. 309). A total of 93 youth participated in the study. The wraparound process evaluated within this project has been described as an “individualized, team-based care planning and coordination process that integrates the efforts of the many helpers who are involved; develops a holistic treatment plan that includes supports for [team members]; and oversees a process of goal setting and progress monitoring” (p. 310). Therefore, this approach adheres to the theoretical phases and principles of wraparound and could be used to determine key performance indicators for this capstone project. Bruns and colleagues (2014) had two research aims: (1) to evaluate the service processes and clinical outcomes of the wraparound treatment; and (2) to examine the fidelity and implementation of the wraparound process (p. 310).

With specific regard to goal attainment, the researchers used structured interviews, surveys, and team observation measures to examine the process of goal setting and progress monitoring (Bruns et al., 2014, pp. 313-314; see Figure 2). The findings of the study revealed that the youth assigned to the wraparound program showed no better functioning than those assigned to the alternative group and had poorer emotional and behavioural problems over time compared to their counterparts (Bruns et al., 2014, pp. 318-319). Furthermore, the wraparound program did not exhibit positive outcomes regarding team alliance, empowerment, or client satisfaction. The findings of the study revealed that the wraparound team processes were implemented inconsistently, which could pose a possible explanation for the unsuccessful outcomes previously noted. For example, statements of mission, goals, or priority needs were not developed; the wraparound teams were not brainstorming individualized strategies to meet youth and family needs; team members were not following through on assigned strategies to achieve goals; and transition plans were not being developed effectively (Bruns et al., 2014, p. 319). Consequently, this lack of fidelity to the four phases and ten principles outlined within the theory of wraparound approaches may have influenced the undesired outcomes. As such, successful goal attainment may be linked to high fidelity of the wraparound process, which is another subtheme the literature has revealed to be an important success indicator in the implementation of wraparound approaches (see Shailer, Gammon, & de Terte, 2017, pp. 87-88).

FIGURE 2. EVALUATION TOOLS FOR MEASURING GOAL ATTAINMENT
Source: Adapted from Bruns et al., 2014, pp. 313-314

In addition to individualized goal setting and strong adherence to the theory of wraparound, Bickman, Smith, Lambert, and Andrade (2003) have revealed that having highly trained case managers who can adequately assess and identify clients’ needs is another important factor in successful goal attainment (p. 135). The researchers conducted a quasi-experimental design to evaluate the effectiveness of a wraparound mental health
service system for child and adolescent military dependents (Bickman et al., 2003, p. 135). Participants were assigned to a wraparound group and a comparison group; 71 families comprised the wraparound group and 40 families comprised the comparison group (Bickman et al., 2003, p. 142). Multiple methods were used to investigate the impact of wraparound on the children’s mental health, including parent-and-youth-reported measures, scores on behavioural checklists, comparison with other evaluations, service needs reported by parents, and other outcome measures. In addition, there were three longitudinal health outcomes measured on seven occasions to determine the effects of the wraparound approach (Bickman et al., 2003, pp. 147-149).

The mental health outcome data revealed that there were no differences in functioning, symptoms, or life satisfaction between the two groups (Bickman et al., 2003, p. 152). According to Bickman and colleagues (2003), a possibility for the failure of the wraparound program to effect positive outcomes may be that the ability to identify and assign clients to the appropriate services may not have been sufficiently developed (p. 152). For example, wraparound assumes that case managers can reliably assign clients to appropriate services; however, the only empirical research examining this issue found that clinicians were not reliable in their placement decisions (Bickman et al., 2003, p. 152). Consequently, if case managers do not receive adequate training to administer the wraparound initiative, this may negatively impact successful goal attainment. If the needs of clients are not accurately determined by case managers, the services clients are assigned to may not be effective in helping them address the complex barriers they face in society, despite how adequately these services are delivered.

The three examples above highlight the importance of goal attainment in determining the effectiveness of a wraparound process. A consideration derived from collectively assessing these studies is the fact that goal attainment is dependent on a number of other components of wraparound. Ensuring that clients engage in a process of goal setting and monitoring through various means, such as the GAS, striving to realize the theoretical underpinnings of wraparound regarding the four phases and ten principles of the initiative in practice, and ensuring that case managers can appropriately determine client needs in order to match clients with effective services are all essential factors that must be present in order to promote successful outcomes (see Bickman et al., 2003; Bruns et al., 2014; Debicki et al., 2012).

These assumptions are supported by the broader literature regarding wraparound effectiveness. For example, Bruns, Suter, and Leverentz-Brady (2008) note that having measures in place that can be individualized and applied to multiple sites, programs, or individuals to determine common trends and patterns of success may be more effective performance measures in wraparound evaluations than standardized procedures (p. 241). According to Bruns and colleagues (2008), when a treatment process is complex, individualized, or does not have a protocol for exact treatment procedures, establishing benchmarks for use in quality assurance and policy decisions is more difficult than assessing whether case managers have engaged in the necessary activities to achieve positive outcomes (p. 241). These suggestions specifically align with Debicki and colleagues’ (2012) emphasis on having a tool that can effectively help clients measure their own varied goals (p. 20), and Bickman and colleagues’ (2003) emphasis on having competent case managers who can adequately promote these activities (p. 152).

Similarly, Walker and Schutte (2004) suggest that successful goal attainment is dependent on having a model of effectiveness for wraparound teamwork, wherein team members’ background, knowledge, and skills enable individuals in the wraparound process to promote the practice of effective goal definition, monitoring, and progress (p. 184). Herein, goal-setting must be adjustable in order to generate various options that clients could engage in to achieve positive outcomes, such as strengthened coping and problem-solving skills, enhanced feelings of competence and empowerment, and an improved quality of life (Walker & Schutte, 2004, p. 184). Feelings of empowerment and an improved quality of life are expected outcomes if there is a high adherence to the theoretical underpinnings of the wraparound approach; therefore, the suggestions of Walker and Schutte (2004) also complement Bruns and colleagues’ (2014) importance to the adherence of the four phases and ten principles of the wraparound process in order to promote successful goal attainment (p. 319).
Another dominant category that emerged in the literature regarding wraparound evaluations is client resilience. Resilience is commonly defined as the “process of, capacity for, or outcome of successful adaptation, despite challenging or threading circumstances” (Debicki et al., 2012, p. 6). Resilience research explores the capacity of individuals, families, organizations, and whole communities to respond positively and effectively to significant adversity and risk (Debicki et al., 2012, p. 6). There are many factors associated with resilience, specifically individual, relationship, community, and cultural factors. Recent trends in resilience research aim to understand how these factors may lead to positive outcomes and what resources are involved. Wraparound evaluations have viewed resilience as a process instead of a personality trait, as it involves the interplay between the individual, family, community, and society with strong temporal, cultural, and individual meanings attached (Debicki et al., 2012, p. 9). One of the main goals of the wraparound approach is to give people control over their lives, thereby building resilience so that they do not feel helpless and powerless (Debicki, 2009, p. 2). Accordingly, it can be assumed that an effective wraparound approach will result in increased levels of resilience among clients, as evidenced in the examples below.

In addition to measuring goal attainment when evaluating the effectiveness of wraparound approaches in partnership with Shalem, Debicki and colleagues (2012) also incorporated two resilience measures: one for youth and one for adults (p. 12). The resilience measures used include an Adult Resilience Scale developed by Odin Hjemdal and Oddgeir Friborg and Ungar’s Child and Youth Resilience Measure (CYRM), as well as selected questions from Michael Ungar’s Pathways to Youth Resilience Measure (the PYRM) that were adapted for adults (Debicki et al., 2012, p. 12). Similar to their GAS approach, Debicki and colleagues (2012) measured resilience at two separate times: (1) the onset of the wraparound process (Time 1); and (2) six months later (Time 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1. RESILIENCE MEASURES IN WRAPAROUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well does this describe your situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you like to see change in this area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel hopeful about my future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well does this describe your situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you like to see change in this area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have a sense of control in my life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well does this describe your situation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you like to see change in this area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have support in my community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, 28 questions of the evaluation focused on resilience. While there were no significant differences for any of the 28 questions answered by youth, there were statistically significant differences found between Time 1 and Time 2 for adults, who reported an increase in their perception of self, having a planned future, and having enhanced social resources (Debicki et al., 2012, p. 20; see Table 1 for the three questions that produced statistically significant results). In addition, the total score on the questionnaire demonstrated a significant overall increase in resilience from Time 1 to Time 2 (Debicki et al., 2012, p. 20). Debicki and colleagues (2012) compared these results with findings they retrieved from their Wraparound Fidelity Index measure and found that high fidelity to the theoretical phases and principles of wraparound is positively correlated with increased resilience (p. 28). Consequently, these data suggest that if wraparound clients experience increased resilience after a given period of receiving the wraparound program, it can be assumed that the wraparound approach was implemented effectively, wherein theory adhered to practice. As such, resilience as an outcome
measure is one that appears to complement the wraparound process due to its emphasis on individual strengths and coping.

Payne-Moss (2017) conducted a non-experimental research study to evaluate the impact of a wraparound program on youth resilience, needs identification, and social supports as additional important factors necessary when aiming to build resilience (pp. 1-3). Specifically, the researcher intended to evaluate whether the wraparound process impacts the needs of at-risk youth and families in order to identify any commonalities about the types of supports, interventions, team engagement, and needs common among successful and unsuccessful wraparound plans of care (Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 47). The researcher collected secondary data through the Northern Ohio Wraparound Agency. The design of this study explored a total of 14 family plans of care to reveal themes common amongst families successfully advancing through the four phases of the wraparound process (Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 49).

### TABLE 2. EVIDENCE OF MET/UNMET NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Plan of Care #</th>
<th>Need Coded</th>
<th>Evidence of Need Met/Unmet</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Team started working on a safety plan around youth leaving home, whereabouts unknown, high risk behaviour and concerns with this ongoing behaviour.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Family requested voluntary termination, as they are not invested in continuing with the wraparound process.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 65

Wraparound family plans of care revealed prioritized needs, interventions, types of supports, and team engagement. With specific respect to resilience, Payne-Moss (2017) evaluated two categories: (1) the wraparound team’s ability to impact the family needs of at-risk youth; and (2) common types of natural, informal, and formal supports amongst successful wraparound plans of care (pp. 70-73). Regarding the first category, of the 14 family plans of care, nine provided need statements within the wraparound plan, totaling 16 needs statements derived by natural⁴, informal⁵, and formal⁶ supports on each family’s wraparound team (Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 70; see Table 2 for evidence of needs met). Of the 16 needs statements, 13 needs were met. The findings revealed that when needs were identified through the wraparound process, 81% of these needs were successfully achieved (Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 71). Further findings also revealed that at least two needs were indicated in 86% of the successful wraparound plans, 43% possessed needs in both safety and self-esteem, and 43% possessed social and self-esteem needs simultaneously. Common among the successful wraparound plans of care were plans to address multiple needs. Over 85% of the successful wraparound plans of care had more than one identified need, and over 83% of the wraparound plans of care met the needs of the families 100% of the time (Payne-Moss, 2017, pp. 75-76).

With respect to the second category, successful wraparound plans of care were identified as “families advancing through the four phases of the wraparound process or families who have completed the four phases of the wraparound process” (Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 73). In total, seven wraparound plans of care were identified as successful, consisting of an average of 11 supports on a wraparound team (Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 73). On average, teams of successful wraparound plans included four natural supports, primarily consisting of family members or friends. Other findings revealed that informal supports, such as school counsellors, teachers, and resource officers, were not as prevalent as formal supports, such as paid professionals, among successful wraparound plans. Three successful wraparound plans did not include any informal supports, while two of the successful wraparound plans lacked informal supports, possessed less than average natural supports, ⁴ Natural supports promote the family vision and goals and typically connect to the family by relationships. These individuals are free to family and provide informal supports (Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 44).
⁵ Informal supports are free community supports, such as school, churches, community organizations, that are beneficial to a family on a wraparound team (Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 44).
⁶ Formal supports include paid professionals hired to provide a service to families, including system supports paid and professionally trained to provide goal-oriented services to families (Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 44).
and included less than average team supports (Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 73). In comparison, successful wraparound plans possessed six or more formal supports, with only two wraparound teams possessing less than the average number of formal supports (Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 74). Case managers were commonly identified as formal supports. Overall, more than 50% of the supports on a wraparound team consisted of formal supports in the majority of successful cases (Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 74).

These findings reveal that when two or more need statements are identified in a wraparound plan and are addressed through natural and formal supports on the wraparound team, the wraparound process can positively impact the family needs of at-risk youth and transform risk into resilience. Consequently, these findings justify the fact that capacity to build resilience amongst clients through various means, such as effective wraparound planning and team building, can be a reliable success indicator in wraparound evaluations. This postulation is further supported by Payne-Moss’ (2017) findings regarding unsuccessful wraparound plans, wherein none of these plans included formal supports and most of them did not appropriately identify prioritized needs (p. 83). As such, further exploring different variables of the wraparound process may contribute to increased knowledge regarding wraparound’s ability to foster resilience among highly vulnerable and at-risk populations. This body of knowledge would be an essential component to consider when implementing wraparound approaches amongst immigration settlement services in order to help foster resilience among newcomers who are facing multiple barriers to integration and settlement.

Overall, the research findings presented by Debicki and colleagues (2012) and Payne-Moss (2017) support the notion that an increase in resilience during the administration of wraparound approaches is a successful indicator in determining the effectiveness of the wraparound program under evaluation. The broader literature regarding resilience also appears to suggest that resilience can be fostered through high expectations, meaningful participation in a given program, and caring relationships. Environments that support the fulfillment of the most basic human needs can provide individuals faced with complex societal barriers the ability to recognize and meet their potential and feel a sense of belonging while being supported, connected, and respected (Benard, 1995, pp. 3-4).

These postulations are especially important in the field of immigration settlement, given that highly vulnerable immigrant and refugee populations who commonly face high levels of poverty, unemployment, or other integration barriers, may experience a sense of exclusion and feel less integrated into Canadian society (Reitz, 2010, para. 9). Consequently, a wraparound process that can effectively name and frame the issues faced by its clients, could result in increased resilience among clients, especially in the field of immigration settlement. In fact, a study conducted by MacDonnell, Dastjerdi, Bokore, and Khanlou (2012) regarding the everyday challenges faced by immigrant women in the Canadian settlement process found that providing these women with an opportunity to describe everyday challenges as individual immigrant women and as members of families, diverse communities, and larger societies, allowed these women to identify their needs in the larger family, community, and social contexts (p. 5). This need identification process led to the realization of the importance of natural supports, such as the presence of positive family networks, in successful settlement (MacDonnell et al., 2012, p. 5). On the contrary, women’s culture, precarious immigration status, language barriers, and a lack of networking in the migration setting increased their vulnerability for being abused (McDonnell et al., 2012, p. 5). With this in mind, a wraparound approach cognizant of the specific risks faced by newcomers that appropriately prioritizes these clients’ needs and surrounds them with effective supports could potentially transform risks into resilience and aid the successful integration of newcomers into society.

### 2.4 Wraparound Fidelity

Fidelity of the wraparound process is another component that is important to consider when measuring the successful delivery of wraparound services. Measuring fidelity determines how adequately the wraparound process has been delivered in practice compared to its original specification or design (Shailer et al., 2017, p. 87). For wraparound, measuring fidelity requires an assessment of the adherence to the basic philosophy, principles, phases, and activities of the wraparound process, including the supports and organizational systems in place to deliver services (Shailer et al., 2017, p. 88). Fidelity measurement could ensure that a wraparound model is not diluted or delivered in a manner that deviates from its principles, thereby facilitating ongoing
quality assurance (Bruns, Suter, Force, & Burchard, 2005, p. 522). As noted in the literature regarding goal attainment, information on the adherence to the wraparound process could also contribute to reliable outcome measures and allow for valid conclusions to be made on the wraparound program’s effectiveness (Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 83; Shailer et al., 2017, p. 88). The following examination of several studies regarding wraparound fidelity is supportive of these postulations.

Shailer and colleagues’ (2017) study has revealed the importance of wraparound fidelity through a quantitative, theory-based measure referred to as the Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (p. 89). The WFI provides a comprehensive assessment of fidelity by obtaining the perspectives of wraparound facilitators, caregivers, youth, and team members through structured interviews that generate quantitative summaries of wraparound fidelity, including: overall fidelity, fidelity of each of the ten wraparound principles, and fidelity by activities in each of the four phases of wraparound (Shailer et al., 2017, p. 88). The focus of Shailer and colleagues’ (2017) study was a wraparound program in New Zealand that was implemented to help foster positive outcomes for youth with serious mental health disorders (p. 89). In total, 16 wraparound teams participated in the study (Shailer et al., 2017, p. 89). Ultimately, the purpose of the study was to investigate the level of wraparound fidelity in accordance with the ten principles and four phases of the standard wraparound approach highlighted in Appendix A (Shailer et al., 2017, p. 88).

**TABLE 3. WRAPAROUND FIDELITY INDEX (WFI) SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fidelity Score</th>
<th>Fidelity Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85 to 100</td>
<td>High Fidelity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 85</td>
<td>Above Average Fidelity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 79</td>
<td>Average Fidelity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 74</td>
<td>Below Average Fidelity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 69</td>
<td>Non-Wraparound Level of Fidelity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bruns et al., 2008, pp. 242-249

Fidelity levels were calculated based on item average scores for combined and individual respondent groups and were compared against average scores derived from the broader literature (see Table 3). The overall fidelity of the wraparound process rated across all respondent groups was approximately 82%, indicating that wraparound fidelity in the New Zealand program was above average (Shailer et al., 2017, p. 91). According to a more detailed breakdown of the results, the implementation phase received the highest fidelity rating, while the engagement and planning phases were rated above average and the transition phase was rated below average. The wraparound principles with the highest level of fidelity included: culturally competent, collaboration, family voice and choice, and persistence. Principles of team-based and strength-based were also rated above average, while the principles of outcome-based and individualized were categorized as average (Shailer et al., 2017, p. 92). Principles of community-based services and natural supports received below average fidelity scores from participants.

These findings suggest that having a successful implementation phase combined with strong principles of cultural competence, collaboration, family voice and choice, and persistence present within the wraparound process could lead to at least an average level or higher of wraparound fidelity. Comparatively, low levels of fidelity regarding the transition phase, natural supports, and community based services could hinder service delivery and prevent clients from achieving positive outcomes. These assumptions are similar to those discussed in the subthemes of goal attainment and client resilience. Bruns and colleagues’ (2014) wraparound evaluation indicated a positive correlation between successful goal attainment and high levels of fidelity (pp. 318-319). Similarly, Payne-Moss’ (2017) research revealed the importance of natural supports to the success of wraparound, specifically when evaluating the program’s ability to build resilience among clients (p. 73). These findings are in accordance with Shailer and colleagues’ results (2017), wherein clients perceived a poor delivery of natural supports within the wraparound program, thereby engaging in lower ratings of fidelity (p. 93). As such, the literature highlighting different success indicators in wraparound evaluations appears to be complementary.
In addition to coherence in the literature, Bruns and colleagues (2008) have conducted a study that validates the WFI’s ability to measure a wraparound program’s adherence to theory (p. 240). According to Bruns and colleagues (2008), once fidelity instruments are created, it may be challenging to determine when adherence scores are good enough, which can be especially inconvenient for service delivery models that are individualized or represent service processes rather than regimented treatment procedures (pp. 240-241). As such, Bruns and colleagues (2008) conducted an empirical study intended to interpret multiple wraparound sites’ fidelity results in order to create benchmark scores for the WFI (p. 241). The researchers retrieved data from 667 youth served by ten wraparound initiatives in nine American states through norm referencing and criterion referencing. Norm referencing included the examination of overall fidelity scores at the site level for the ten programs within the study via variance analyses to determine significant differences across these sites (Bruns et al., 2008, p. 244). Criterion referencing was undertaken through a review of published studies that presented WFI data for two or more groups that differed with respect to one or more external criteria. External criteria could include: data on outcomes for two or more independent groups; specific information describing differences in the state of supports for the wraparound program; and specific information describing differences in the nature of services delivered (Bruns et al., 2008, p. 245). The information gathered and analyzed through these means resulted in the determination of the benchmarks used by Shailer and colleagues (2017) for the purpose of their study (see Table 3).

Overall, Bruns and colleagues’ (2008) ability to determine standard benchmarks for the WFI is an important factor in wraparound evaluations, as it allows researchers to use this information to interpret WFI scores, thereby enabling an analysis of the wraparound initiative’s theoretical state and practical success. Therefore, having the tools to determine the achievement of high-fidelity wraparound programs could be useful in uncovering best practices within wraparound approaches that could be translated to various fields of service delivery. For example, a study about youth offenders with mental health disorders found that youth in Connections – an individualized, coordinated mental health service within an American youth corrections department – were less likely to recidivate than youth receiving mental health and youth justice in a traditional way (Pullman, Kerbs, Koroloff, Veach-White, Gaylor, & Sieler, 2006, p. 388). Although this evaluation lacked a measure of wraparound fidelity, Connections met certain requirements that have been associated with effective wraparound, including family involvement and flexible funding (Pullman et al., 2006, p. 391). In addition, wraparound staff were trained in wraparound principles and received regular consultation and supervision from youth corrections officers to ensure that the approach was being implemented correctly (Pullman et al., 2006, p. 391).

Similarly, Anderson, Wright, Kooreman, Mohr, and Russell (2003) performed a program evaluation of the Dawn Project, which provides coordinated services to troubled youth through a wraparound approach (p. 64). The project has been recognized as community-based, child and family centred, culturally competent, and financed through non-categorical, flexible means (Anderson et al., 2003, p. 64). These characteristics are strongly aligned with the ten principles of the wraparound approach. Preliminary results of the evaluation revealed that youth in the Dawn Project experience significant clinical improvement during the first years of receiving services, a reduction in the use of more restrictive settings, and a decrease in recidivism among those who successfully complete the Program (Anderson et al., 2003, p. 63).

Evidently, there are studies that support the ability of wraparound approaches in acquiring successful outcomes. As such, having a reliable fidelity measure and standardized benchmarks that enable comparative analyses could be useful in determining the practices employed within these wraparound approaches that result in the most effective outcomes. Wraparound philosophy demands a comprehensive approach from system-wide administrative policy down to individual agency (Pullman et al., 2006, p. 391). Therefore, it is significantly more challenging to isolate the independent variables for an evaluation than it is in less ecologically based programs. Employing a measure of fidelity in the program model could enhance the findings of wraparound evaluations.
Working alliance is another theme that was commonly referred to as a success indicator among the literature. Working alliance is often defined as the relationship between a client and the professional or natural supports available, referred to as the client’s wraparound team (Hatcher & Gillapsy, 2006, p. 12). It is a means by which the client and the team hope to engage with each other and effect beneficial change in the client. According to Bruns and colleagues (2015), working alliance is important for measuring the effectiveness of the wraparound model due to the consistent links that have been found between measures of the working alliance and therapy outcomes in psychotherapy research (p. 318). Hatcher and Gillapsy (2006) explain that alliance must be a collaborative feature of the client and the team, composed of three aspects: (1) agreement between client and the team on the goals of the wraparound process; (2) the client’s agreement with the team that the tasks of the wraparound process will address the challenges faced by the client; and (3) the quality of the interpersonal bond between the client and the team (p. 12). The development of the bond may enhance the agreement on goals and tasks and vice versa.

While the necessity of working alliance is noted within the theoretical underpinnings of the wraparound approach, Giatrelis (2017) conducted a primary study to investigate the usefulness of wraparound session and outcome rating scales (p. 1). The study focused on a wraparound program in New England administered to youth with serious emotional disturbance. Specifically, the study examined the relationship between: (1) client perceptions of their working alliance with case managers and child outcomes; (2) client perceptions of their working alliance with case managers and observer-rated fidelity to the wraparound program; and (3) the use of a rating scale regarding case managers’ perceptions and responses during wraparound sessions (Giatrelis, 2017, p. 1). Methods employed for answering these research questions included archival data and qualitative interviews collected from three case managers and one wraparound coach. The researcher examined the closed case files of 44 families.

Giatrelis (2017) found that the perceptions of clients regarding working alliance with their wraparound team and case manager were not necessarily indicative of their perceptions regarding their progress and outcomes throughout the wraparound process (p. 55). In other words, clients who did not believe that they were successfully attaining their goals, did not automatically have a negative perception of their working alliance with their wraparound team or case manager. In fact, the majority of clients who experienced unsuccessful goal attainment held positive perceptions of their wraparound team and exhibited respect and gratefulness toward their case manager (Giatrelis, 2017, pp. 55-56). In some instances, clients expressed their appreciation toward their wraparound team and case manager through noting the team’s dedication to serving each clients’ unique needs and the case manager’s efforts to determine and act on each client’s best interest through applying team resources more effectively in high-need or emergency situations (Giatrelis, 2017, p. 56).

Comparatively, Hawley and Weisz (2010) found that a positive working alliance between clients and service providers may be a key process underlying client retention, satisfaction with services, and positive outcomes (p. 118). While negative goal attainment was not correlated with working alliance, goal attainment did appear to be correlated with the fidelity of the wraparound approach. Similarly, Giatrelis (2017) found that positive outcomes for clients may be associated with the fidelity of wraparound implementation, given that adherence
to the wraparound model appeared to result in positive outcomes for clients (pp. 58-59). These findings are in accordance with the results of Bickman and colleagues (2003) and Shailer and colleagues (2017). High levels of fidelity were also correlated with positive remarks regarding working alliance (Giatrelis, 2017, pp. 58-59). Consequently, it appears that adherence to theoretical underpinnings of the wraparound approach could also result in positive working alliance among clients, team members, and case managers.

These postulations are supported by further research studies measuring working alliance through the Working Alliance Inventory (WAI), which comprises 36 items in three subscales of 12 items each, rated on a seven-point Likert scale. The measure has 14 negatively and 22 positively worded items measuring client and team agreement in regard to goals, tasks, and bond (Hatcher & Gillaspy, 2007, p. 15; see Figure 3). Using the WAI, Hawley and Weisz (2005) have noted the importance of a positive working alliance for client persistence in the wraparound program, motivation to address problems, compliance with goal objectives, and positive outcomes (p. 117). Bruns and colleagues (2015) also found strong correlations between satisfaction, empowerment, and working alliance variables in their study when measuring the effectiveness of wraparound versus traditional case management for children and adolescents (p. 317). With that said, it can be assumed that the successful delivery of the wraparound process requires positive working alliance between the client, team, and case manager. As such, it is important for wraparound evaluations to consider the working alliance between the client and the team in order to uncover opportunities for improving or replicating the delivery of services with other clients in similar or different contexts.

Having a positive working alliance between wraparound clients, team members, and case managers is especially important if the wraparound approach is applied to immigration settlement. Due to language and cultural barriers, among other factors, newcomers often tend to feel misunderstood when seeking services in their new country. For example, Pollock, Newbold, Lafrenière, and Edge (2012) found that when asked directly if they had “experienced racial discrimination or been treated unfairly by a health care worker or other staff in a hospital or clinic,” 17 out of 26 participants replied they had personally experienced discrimination at least one time when interacting with a health care practitioner or clinic staff in Ontario (p. 65). Instances of discrimination ranged in severity from overt forms, such as verbal abuse, to more subtle forms, such as rudeness. Reported incidents were broadly categorized in terms of refusal of health care; staff acting as gatekeepers; and communication barriers and cultural insensitivity (Pollock et al., 2012, p. 65).

Similarly, the 2009 General Social Survey revealed that discrimination based on ethnicity or culture, followed by race or colour, were the most common forms of discrimination faced by landed immigrants (Nangia, 2013, p. 5). Another important basis for discrimination was language. A substantial proportion of the newcomer population has also experienced discrimination from people in authority, including police, judges, and teachers. Among those landed immigrants who had experienced discrimination, 28% reported that they were discriminated against by a person in authority (Nangia, 2013, pp. 5-7). Approximately 25% of landed immigrants who faced discrimination reported that they were discriminated against by service providers. More than a tenth of those who were discriminated against (12%), received unfair treatment from both persons in authority and service providers (Nangia, 2013, pp. 5-7). With that said, it is justifiable to assume that successful working alliance would be an especially important factor in the successful implementation of a wraparound approach regarding immigration settlement, given that the concept of this notion is to ensure that clients within the program feel heard, understood, respected, and cared for.

### 2.6 Overall Client Satisfaction with the Wraparound Process

The final element common among variables measuring the effectiveness of wraparound approaches is client satisfaction (Bickman, Smith, Lambert, & Andrade, 2003, p. 142; Bruns et al., 2015, p. 313; Debicki et al., 2014, p. 3). Client satisfaction generally refers to clients’ perception of the wraparound services they receive, specifically whether the wraparound process successfully addressed their unique needs (Bickman et al., 2003, p. 142). Overall client satisfaction in wraparound is typically measured through administering Likert-scale questionnaires ranging between “extremely satisfied” and “extremely dissatisfied” continuums in regard to the
individualized services and averaging each participant’s ratings across the subset of services and questionnaires (Rosen, Heckman, Carro, & Burchard, 1994, p. 59).

When Rosen and colleagues (1994) conducted a survey to examine the overall satisfaction of children and adolescents receiving wraparound services, the researchers found that most of the youth who participated in the study were satisfied with the wraparound services, especially youth who felt involved in their treatment and believed that their care was unconditional (p. 65). Youth who reported high levels of satisfaction also reported feelings of being listened to; feelings that their opinions were elicited and respected by case managers; and high perceptions of having some control over their services (Rosen et al., 1994, p. 65).

These findings are further supported in the broader literature. LaPorte, Haber, and Malloy (2014) examined the relationships between participation of adult supports, including caregivers, teachers, and other human service professionals in wraparound teams, and youth perceptions of services in programs designed to meet their developmental needs (p. 615). Specifically, the study examined the associations between levels of youth satisfaction with their levels of self-determination in services, their wraparound teams, and their service experiences overall (LaPorte et al., 2016, p. 615). Data was collected through one-on-one interviews conducted with 36 high-school students who had been enrolled in school-based wraparound services for approximately six months. Satisfaction was measured through a Youth and Family Involvement in Teams (YFIT) survey, which is a structured interview that assesses satisfaction using Likert-scale items that ask youth to rate their level of agreement with statements related to general satisfaction, team processes, and self-determination (LaPorte et al., 2016, p. 616; see Table 4).

### TABLE 4. EXAMPLES FROM THE YOUTH AND FAMILY INVOLVEMENT IN TEAMS (YFIT) SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Satisfaction</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, how satisfied were you with the services that you have received?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Processes</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Someone helped me plan what I wanted to say at meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Determination</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I had the final say in all decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from LaPorte et al., 2016, p. 616

The findings revealed that general satisfaction was the highest rated YFIT factor, followed by self-determination and team processes (LaPorte et al., 2016, p. 618). Essentially, these results revealed that at-risk youth who felt supported by their caregivers, case managers, and other supports participated in the wraparound program more frequently than youth who did not have stable supports (LaPorte et al., 2016, p. 626). Similarly, Walker, Pullman, Moser, and Bruns (2012) found that high-quality engagement and team-processes that encouraged meaningful team participation could better maintain youth’s participation in the wraparound process due to higher levels of satisfaction with the implementation of the wraparound approach (p. 196). Youth also appreciated having their voice heard and acquiring a sense of autonomy throughout the wraparound process. These findings are supported by Walker and Schutte (2004), who found that teams with higher planning processes produced more individualized plans and had higher satisfaction among clients (p. 184). As

---

7 The general satisfaction scale consists of four items assessing overall satisfaction with services, including teams as well as other aspects of services (i.e. one-on-one meetings with the specialist) and progress toward goals (LaPorte et al., 2016, p. 616).
8 The team processes scale consists of three items assessing youth’s perceptions of positive qualities of team meetings (i.e. supportiveness, productivity), and whether they were prepared by their transition specialists to participate in meetings (LaPorte et al., 2016, p. 616).
9 The self-determination scale consists of four items focusing on the degree to which youth believe they were adequately autonomous in developing and implementing plans with their teams (LaPorte et al., 2016, p. 616).
such, these findings indicate that individuals who have a positive relationship with one or more members of their wraparound team generally exhibit greater levels of satisfaction with the wraparound program. The study revealed that integrated services, wherein youth had the opportunity to interact with various service providers or engage in multiple activities, also resulted in greater levels of satisfaction and self-determination among clients (LaPorte et al., 2016, p. 626). Furthermore, the authors believe that satisfaction with team and broader service processes could lead to positive outcomes, such as youth employment, education, and behavioural functioning (LaPorte et al., 2016, pp. 626-627).

The two studies suggest that high levels of satisfaction with the wraparound program may be correlated with successful goal attainment, as noted by Hawley and Weisz (2010, p. 118). While Rosen and colleagues (1994) caution that positive findings are common in the satisfaction literature and may be a function of demand characteristics or social desirability, these findings provide some evidence for the legitimacy of the principles of wraparound and suggest ways to increase satisfaction in effort of improving outcomes (pp. 64-65). As such, incorporating this measure in wraparound evaluations could effectively reveal aspects of wraparound that are working well and areas that require improvement.

2.7 Summary of Literature Review & Evaluation Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Attainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• One of the most dominant evaluation categories that emerged in the literature regarding the evaluation of various wraparound approaches to service delivery is goal attainment. The four phases of the wraparound process – engagement and team preparation; initial plan development; plan implementation; and transition – are intended to oversee a process of goal setting and progress monitoring. Accordingly, the plan that is developed for the individual is expected to reflect their goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client Resilience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Resilience is commonly defined as the “process of, capacity for, or outcome of successful adaptation, despite challenging or threading circumstances”. Resilience research explores the capacity of individuals, families, organizations, and whole communities to respond positively and effectively to significant adversity and risk. Studies show that a wraparound process that can effectively name and frame the issues faced by its clients could result in increased resilience among clients, especially in the field of immigration settlement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wraparound Fidelity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Measuring fidelity determines how adequately the wraparound process has been delivered in practice compared to its original specification or design. For wraparound, measuring fidelity requires an assessment of the adherence to the basic philosophy, principles, phases, and activities of the wraparound process, including the supports and organizational systems in place. Fidelity measurement could ensure that a wraparound model is not diluted or delivered in a manner that deviates from its principles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Alliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Working alliance is often defined as the relationship between a client and the professional or natural supports available, referred to as the client’s team. It is a means by which the client and the team hope to engage with each other and effect beneficial change in the client. Working alliance is important for measuring the effectiveness of the wraparound model due to the consistent links that have been found between measures of working alliance and therapy outcomes in psychotherapy research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Client Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Client satisfaction generally refers to clients’ perception of the wraparound services they receive, specifically whether the wraparound process successfully addressed their unique needs. Overall client satisfaction in wraparound is typically measured through administering Likert-scale questionnaires ranging between “extremely satisfied” and “extremely dissatisfied” continua in regard to the individualized services. High levels of satisfaction with the wraparound program may be correlated with successful goal attainment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4. SUMMARY OF LITERATURE REVIEW THEMES
Overall, the literature review has revealed that the five main themes highlighted in Figure 4 could answer the research questions of the current study. Due to their proven importance as performance indicators within wraparound approaches, the research methods and tasks for this study have been undertaken within an evaluation framework that was informed by the themes from the literature review: goal attainment; client resilience; fidelity of the wraparound process; working alliance; and overall client satisfaction with the wraparound process. This information instigated the employment of an inductive, qualitative evaluation methodology that is underlined by a grounded theory approach, wherein existing theories may be elaborated or modified as incoming data are meticulously assessed against them (Strauss & Corbin, 1994, p. 273).

Accordingly, the evaluation framework focuses on three main elements: (1) a consistent, clear, and comprehensive description of the NWSP that underlines the conceptual framework for data collection and analysis; (2) a discrete and accurate definition of key Program components in order to ensure that correct and sufficient information was collected for the purposes of evaluation; and (3) meaningful performance measures that demonstrated whether the objectives of VIRCS’ NWSP were effectively met. Collectively, these elements have been supplemented by grounded theory to establish the evaluation framework for this study.
3.0 Methodology and Methods

3.1 Introduction

This research study employed an exploratory research design. According to Stebbins (2001), “Social science exploration is a broad-ranging, purposive, systematic, prearranged undertaking designed to maximize the discovery of generalizations leading to description and understanding of an area of social or psychological life,” (p. 3). This type of research design is commonly employed when researchers have limited scientific knowledge about the group, process, activity, or situation they wish to examine, but nonetheless believe it contains elements worth exploring (Bartlett & Varvus, 2017, p. 7; Stebbins, 2001, p. 5). Accordingly, an exploratory research design was fitting to evaluate the effectiveness of VIRCS’ NWSP, given that the organization has not evaluated the Program in the past and research on the effectiveness of wraparound approaches among highly vulnerable newcomers is minimal.

The purpose of this research was to answer the main research question and the secondary research questions introduced in Chapter 1:

To what extent, if any, does VIRCS’ NWSP effectively help vulnerable newcomers navigate multiple barriers to social integration and immigration settlement?

- What is the current state of VIRCS’ NWSP?
- What aspects of the Program are working well?
- What aspects of the Program can be improved?
- What are immediate, short-term recommendations for improvement and additional, long-term recommendations for improvement?
- How can changes be implemented in consideration of monetary funds, human resources, and time?

This chapter describes the research design for this project, explaining the methodology, methods, data analysis, and project limitations/delimitations involved to answer the primary and secondary research question(s).

3.2 Methodology

The methodology employed to undertake this research was a mixed-methods approach, wherein quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection have been integrated to address the research problem more fully and to obtain the answers to quantitative and qualitative questions within a single study. Integrating a mixed-methods approach can help researchers reach more justifiable and more complete study conclusions (Clark & Ivankova, 2016, p. 4). Given that there is very little known about the effectiveness of wraparound in the field of immigration settlement, the collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data in an iterative analytic process can provide important information on emergent and unexpected themes.

In addition to a mixed-methods approach, an impact evaluation approach was implemented. An impact evaluation addresses process and outcome components in order to determine overall program effectiveness in achieving its ultimate goals (Department of Health and Human Services, n. d., p. 1). Process evaluation refers to program monitoring, as it strives to determine whether program activities have been implemented correctly and resulted in desirable outputs. Comparatively, outcome evaluation is objective-based as it measures the degree to which the program affects the target population’s behaviour (Department of Health and Human Services, n. d., p. 2). Process evaluation questions consider what the program has done and examine whether there are any barriers to program implementation, whereas outcome evaluation questions measure whether the program has resulted in positive changes for clients and examine the existence of unintended consequences. Combined, this information provides an impact report that can be used as evidence in policy and funding decisions. An overall impact evaluation is appropriate for this project, as it could help answer the main research question and secondary research questions.
Upon receiving approval from the Human Research Ethics Board at the University of Victoria, data collection occurred between March and May of 2019 through two concurrent methods: (1) quantitative surveys and (2) qualitative semi-structured, open-ended interviews. Survey research is defined as the quantitative “collection of information from a sample of individuals through their responses to questions” (Check & Schutt, 2012, p. 160). Surveys can be administered to a large number of people in a timely manner and are beneficial in mixed-methods research, as they allow for the use of quantitative research strategies, such as questionnaires with numerically rated items, and qualitative research strategies, such as open-ended questions (Ponto, 2015, para. 2). In-depth interviewing is a qualitative research technique that involves conducting individual interviews with a small number of respondents to explore their perspectives on a particular program, idea, or situation (Boyce & Neale, 2006, p. 3). With respect to program evaluations, interviews complement survey data as they provide more detailed information that helps complete the picture of the data retrieved through quantitative methods.

**Survey and Interview Guides**

The survey and interview guides for this project were developed in accordance with the information derived from the literature review and included both outcome and process evaluation questions to determine the overall impact of the NWSP, as illustrated in Figure 5. It is important to note that the survey and interview guides did not incorporate any of the pre-established measures noted in the literature to absolution. Rather, several components from the measures listed in Figure 5 were used to inform the questions for the survey and interview guides. Nonetheless, measures were developed to specifically examine the effectiveness of the NWSP through evaluating the extent of goal attainment, client resilience, wraparound fidelity, working alliance, and overall client satisfaction exhibited among current and former NWSP clients. These findings were then supplemented through interviews with program administrators to provide a holistic illustration of the current state of the NWSP, determine the aspects of the Program that are working well, and highlight
practicable opportunities for improvement. Through the adaptation of these various measures, an entirely new impact evaluation framework was developed that is completely unique to VIRCS’ NWSP.

The survey was administered to current and former NWSP clients, and consisted of 42 questions that were divided into six sections: (1) the current state of the NWSP; (2) clients’ experience with the Program; (3) clients’ goal achievement through the Program; (4) clients’ satisfaction with the Program; (5) suggestions for improvement; and (6) demographic information. Most of the survey questions were closed-ended, consisting of Likert-scales ranging between “1=Strongly Disagree” and “5=Strongly Agree.” For a full review of the survey, please see Appendix B.

There were two separate interview guides that were administered as well. One interview guide was administered to current and former NWSP clients, and the other interview guide was administered to VIRCS’ Settlement Team. The interview guide for current and former NWSP clients consisted of 16 questions and was divided into two sections: (1) certain survey questions explored in further detail, and (2) demographic information, albeit participants were not obligated to reveal their demographic information. The interview guide for the Settlement Team explored participants’ perceptions of the NWSP in relation to client satisfaction, funding, resources, working alliance, and the Program’s ability to help achieve its goals. There were seven interview questions in total. In accordance with an exploratory research design, it is important to note that in both instances, the interview questions were there to prompt participants to discuss information relevant to the main and secondary research question(s); however, participants were free to disclose as much or as little information as they wished and discuss issues of their choosing. On average, the interviews lasted 30 minutes. For a full review of the interview guides, please see Appendix C. The interviews for all three Groups were also recorded through a voice recording device in order to allow for transcription and data verification later in the research process.

**Research Participants and Sampling**

As aforementioned, there were three groups of participants that the researcher was interested in: (1) Current clients of the NWSP; (2) Former clients of the NWSP; and (3) the Settlement Team employed by VIRCS responsible for administering the NWSP. For the remainder of this report, current clients will be referred to as Group 1; former clients will be referred to as Group 2; and the Settlement Team will be referred to as Group 3.

In regard to Group 1, there were approximately 100 clients enrolled in the NWSP as of January of 2019; data collection for this study commenced in March of 2019, therefore it is justifiable to assume that the number of clients enrolled in the Program remained similar between January and March. According to VIRCS’ Director of Settlement Services, the NWSP serves approximately 350 to 500 clients annually, with a new intake process beginning every third month of the fiscal year. While the exact number of former clients is unknown to the researcher, the NWSP was first implemented by VIRCS in October of 2012. Consequently, it can be assumed that there are between 500 and 1,000 former clients served by the Program in Greater Victoria. As of March of 2019, six individuals comprise the Settlement Team for VIRCS. As such, the target population for these different groups of research participants included: approximately 100 current NWSP clients (Group 1); between 500 and 1,000 former NWSP clients (Group 2); and six Settlement Team workers (Group 3).

Overall, purposive sampling was implemented to recruit research participants. Purposive sampling is a series of strategic choices regarding whom, where, and how the research study is conducted (Plays, 2008, p. 697). Rather than ensuring an accurate representation of the population wherein results are generalizable, purposive sampling is less often interested in examining central tendency in a larger group and more interested in studying case study analysis: why particular people feel particular ways, the processes by which these attitudes are constructed, and the role they play in dynamic processes within the organization or group (Plays, 2008, p. 697). Consequently, data retrieved through purposive sampling may not be representative of the entire target population. However, purposive sampling was appropriate for VIRCS’ NWSP, given that the target population for the three different groups of interest was fairly small. With respect to Groups 1 and 2, everyone aged 19 who met the eligibility criteria for the study had an equal chance of participating in the research. Specifically, newcomers – immigrants and refugees – aged 19 and over who were receiving NWSP services or received
NWSP any time in the past through VIRCS were eligible to participate in the study. With respect to Group 3, all members of the Settlement Team were eligible to participate in interviews.

**Recruitment**

Recruitment for Groups 1 and 2 occurred in two phases: Phase 1: Surveys and Phase 2: Interviews.

**Phase 1: Surveys** – Recruitment for the surveys initially occurred through a Recruitment Poster that included a brief highlight of the purpose of the survey, eligibility criteria, a link to the online survey using Survey Monkey, and directions to access a physical copy of the survey through VIRCS. The surveys were available in physical copies and online. The researcher asked the administration staff at VIRCS to e-mail a PDF version of the recruitment poster to all current and former NWSP clients through the organization’s generic e-mail address: info@vircs.bc.ca. The researcher also displayed the recruitment poster at VIRCS and advertised a link to the online survey through VIRCS’ website.

**Phase 2: Interviews** – All survey respondents were invited to participate in an interview. Participants who completed the surveys online were invited to participate in an interview via an information box that appeared after submitting the survey. Physical copies of the survey contained the same information box at the end of the survey. This information box provided the researcher’s cellphone number and student e-mail address. If prospective participants wished to engage in an interview, they could contact the researcher to organize an interview date and time at a convenient and safe location for both parties, or over the phone.

These recruitment methods for Groups 1 and 2 only resulted in five survey responses and zero interview responses within the month of March, mainly due to language barriers and cultural differences. According to VIRCS’ Settlement Team, newcomers were more susceptible to participating in the research if the researcher interacted with them directly face to face, given newcomers’ general appreciation for collectivism instead of isolated processes. Consequently, the researcher translated the recruitment poster, surveys, and associated consent forms into Simplified Chinese and Arabic because these two languages were the most commonly spoken by the clients enrolled in the NWSP at the time of data collection. Between April and May, the recruitment posters, surveys, and associated consent forms were available in three languages: English, Simplified Chinese, and Arabic. The researcher also spent Mondays and Thursdays at VIRCS between April and May in order to administer surveys and/or interviews if eligible clients attending VIRCS were interested in participating in the research, and she encouraged members of the Settlement Team to inform their clients about the opportunity to participate in the research study. These alterations in recruitment methods increased participation by 35 survey respondents and 5 interview respondents, totaling 40 surveys and 5 interviews received between March and May of 2019 for Groups 1 and 2.

With respect to Group 3, the researcher did not distribute anonymous surveys to the Settlement Team, given that it comprised of less than ten members. A small sample size poses the risk of associating identifying factors with survey respondents. This Group was contacted through their VIRCS e-mail address to participate in an interview. During the data collection period, the NWSP experienced some staff turnover. However, in total, six members of the Settlement Team participated in the interviews between March and May of 2019.

**Incentives**

The recruitment process for all three groups of interest was also supplemented by the availability of incentives. Specifically, there were three incentive draws available: (1) five $25.00 Visa Gift Cards for Groups 1 and 2 survey participants; (2) a Chromebook Laptop valued between $350.00 and $400.00 for Groups 1 and 2 interview participants; and (3) $150.00 Visa Gift Card for Group 3 interview participants.

**Draw 1: Five $25.00 Visa Gift Cards for Groups 1 and 2** – Participants had the chance to enter their name into a draw to win one of five of these Visa Gift Cards. Newcomers with complex or overwhelming barriers to settlement and integration could benefit from a $25.00 Visa Gift Card, as it could be used for groceries, clothing, or other basic needs to support physiological wellbeing. For those who completed the survey online,
an information box appeared after they submitted the survey to enter their name, phone number, and/or e-mail address into a virtual draw to win the incentive. Those who submitted physical copies of the survey could enter their name, phone number, and/or e-mail address into a cardboard box displayed at VIRCS. Once all the surveys were submitted, the researcher combined the virtual and physical draws to determine one winner. Combining the virtual and physical incentive entries also controlled against double survey submissions.

**Draw 2: Chromebook Laptop for Groups 1 and 2** – This incentive only applied to Groups 1 and 2. Survey respondents who chose to participate in an interview had the chance to win a Chromebook Laptop, valued between $350.00 and $400.00. This incentive was a second draw, wherein participants had the opportunity to enter their name, phone number, and/or e-mail address for a chance to win the laptop. Making the incentive a likelihood instead of guaranteed reduced undue coercion or influence to participate. In addition, the researcher assumed that having a second incentive available would likely increase the rate of participation in interviews among a target population with historically low response rates. Furthermore, laptops can be useful for newcomers, as they can be used by more than one family member for job applications, skills training, educational purposes, and recreation, among other alternatives.

**Draw 3: $150.00 Visa Gift Card for Group 3** – This incentive only applied to Group 3. Participants had the chance to enter their contact information into a separate draw for a chance to win a $150.00 Visa Gift Card. While response rates were not expected to be as low among this Group as response rates for Groups 1 and 2, the incentive was available to mitigate any feelings of inequity or partiality that may arise if incentives were only available for Groups 1 and 2.

For all three draws, whoever name was chosen was contacted using the information provided in the draw. The researcher either mailed the incentives to the winners or arranged for a time and place for pick-up. The personal contact information in the draws was destroyed (i.e. shredded or deleted) after the winners were identified. The researcher personally paid for the research incentives and the costs associated with distributing them (i.e. envelopes, postages, packaging, etc.).

**PROCEDURES FOR ANALYSIS**

Survey Monkey was the online platform that was used to collect data for the surveys and to generate descriptive statistics.

The analysis of interview data was conducted using NVivo, which is a software that allows researchers to organize, store, and retrieve data so they can work more efficiently, save time, and rigorously back up findings with evidence (NVivo, 2018, para. 2). This analysis occurred in four phases: (1) transcription; (2) general querying; (3) coding into themes and subthemes; and (4) theme justification. The first phase of the analysis involved transcribing the interviews within NVivo and transferring them into a table in Microsoft Word that illustrated time stamps, the questions asked by the researcher, and the responses given by the participant. Next, the researcher used general querying within NVivo, wherein she sifted through the transcriptions using search terms derived from events, behaviours, activities, strategies, states, meanings (i.e. norms, symbols, and feelings), participation, relationships, conditions or constraints, consequences, settings, and context present within the transcribed data. Examples of query terms included:

- “Change”, “Improvement”, “I wish they had more”, “It would be better if”
- “I came to VIRCS because”, “I needed help with”, “Housing”, “Employment”, “School”, “Learn English”
- “Working well”, “My favourite part”, “I love”
- “I want to give back”, “I keep fighting”, “I am stronger”
- “Accountabilities and responsibilities”
- “Fidelity to the wraparound program”, “Client satisfaction”, “Client resilience”, “Goal attainment”, “Working alliance”
- “Strengths of the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program”, “Opportunities for Improvement”
- “Passion”, “Zeal”
The information retrieved through these query terms in addition to a detailed overview of each transcription led to the third phase of analysis, wherein subthemes were amalgamated into general categories. The major themes for interviews conducted with Groups 1 and 2 were: demographics; immigration history; reasons for accessing the NWSP; internal success factors to immigration and settlement; strengths of the NWSP; and opportunities for improvement. The major themes for interviews conducted with Group 3 were: client satisfaction; wraparound fidelity; immigration challenges; strengths of the NWSP; and opportunities for improvement.

The fourth phase consisted of a final reading of the data in order to justify the themes. Techniques used to justify themes were informed by the work of Ryan and Bernard (2003) and included: repetitions, use of newcomer typologies or categories (i.e. looking for local terms that are used in unfamiliar ways), metaphors or analogies, transitions, similarities, differences, linguistic connections (i.e. “cause” “since” “as a result” which often indicate causal connections), missing data (inferring a theme based on what was not said), and theory related material (i.e. the themes identified in the literature).

3.4 Project Limitations and Delimitations

LIMITATIONS

While the research design of this project underwent significant efforts to ensure that the methods employed for data collection were conducive of VIRCS’ NWSP, there are several limitations and delimitations that must be considered. The primary limitations of this research design derive from the weaknesses associated with the employed research methods: surveys and semi-structured, open-ended interviews.

Surveys – disadvantages of surveys are particularly related to participants’ comprehension of the questions, data analysis, and time. If participants misunderstand questions, they might skip some questions they deem vague or too difficult to answer (Albudaiwi, 2018, p. 4). In addition, participants’ answers might be unclear or inaccurate based on their understanding of the questions. Surveys using open-ended questions may also discourage participants from completing the survey if they believe that the activity will take a considerable amount of time or effort, especially when provided in a foreign language. In addition, responses completed by hand may be illegible or drift off course from the intended direction of the research. Finally, some respondents may not provide much thought into answering survey questions, thereby providing random answers that could produce incorrect findings and data analysis (Albudaiwi, 2018, p. 4).

Such shortcomings were certainly present in the current research. Five surveys were discarded due to incomplete information that prevented the data from adding any meaning to the intent of the research. Furthermore, given that approximately 500 to 1,000 individuals were eligible to complete the survey, 40 returned surveys indicates between a 4% and 8% response rate, which is significantly low. There are several reasons that could explain the low response rate. First, the Program evaluation occurred at the end of an intake period; therefore, many of the enrolled clients were completing wraparound services and transitioning out of the Program. Second, due to turnovers among the Settlement Team during the evaluation period, many clients did not access VIRCS’ services as frequently while they waited for a new case manager. Third, immigrant populations are known to have historically low response rates in primary research due to cultural differences, language barriers, and mistrust of authority figures, among other reasons.

Finally, while there were only a few open-ended questions included in the survey, these questions were specifically intended to generate information regarding the strengths of the NWSP and opportunities for improvement. However, the majority of respondents provided short answers consisting between one and two sentences, thereby requiring substantial interpretation that may be inaccurate. A part of this may be due to the fact that participants were encouraged to provide their answers in English in order to avoid translation barriers. However, there is a possibility that they did not feel comfortable providing their answers in English, thereby writing the bare minimum expected of them. Nevertheless, the purpose of implementing a mixed-methods research approach was to ensure that the quantitative survey information could be enhanced through
qualitative interviews. Despite the noted limitations of the survey in this project, when survey responses were compared with interview data, there were significant commonalities among the two, suggesting that the data could be valid and produce meaningful information to some extent.

**Semi-Structured, Open-Ended Interviews** – One of the main disadvantages of interviews is that they are time-consuming, because they need to be transcribed, coded, and possibly translated (Alshenqeeti, 2014, p. 42). In addition, the interviewer’s subconscious bias could result in leading questions that may impact the integrity of the data, and participants may only give what they are prepared to reveal about their perceptions of events and opinions. This information may be subjective and change over time based on circumstance, thereby questioning the capability of interviews to inform understandings of the meanings participants make of their lived experience (Alshenqeeti, 2014, p. 42). Consequently, the researcher took careful measures to ensure that the survey and interview guides did not present leading questions in favour of personal or client expectations that may generate self-fulfilling prophecies. In addition, the semi-structured nature of the interviews allowed for the pre-established questions to act as mere guides during the interview, while providing the necessary space for participants to share as much information as they wished. In this way, eliciting biased responses was mitigated. Furthermore, the researcher practiced competencies of cultural agility and intercultural awareness, given that the majority of research participants were newcomers.

**DELIMITATIONS**

In addition to the noted limitations, several delimitations were also present. Specifically, this study was short-term, instead of longitudinal. Moreover, the surveys were only administered in English, Simplified Chinese, and Arabic, despite the fact that there were newcomers enrolled in the Program who spoke other languages. Similarly, the interviews were conducted only in English. However, translating the surveys into every language spoken at VIRCS and hiring translators for interviews would have been unaffordable and would have required a considerably longer amount of time for data collection than expected. Given these delimitations, it is possible that some of the meaning behind the information provided was not adequately captured.

Furthermore, research participants were selected via purposeful sampling instead of random sampling, wherein they were sought-after based on pre-selected criteria derived from the research questions (i.e. highly vulnerable newcomers registered in VIRCS’ NWSP). Due to this sampling method, there were no control groups to strengthen the reliability and validity of the research, given that effectiveness was measured through evaluating one wraparound approach without any comparison groups. As such, the data retrieved from the sample may not be generalizable to the entire population.

Moreover, program evaluations tend to be rigorous in nature, employing pre-established performance indicators and targets that could be assessed against measurable outcomes over time in order to determine effectiveness. However, the researcher was tasked to create an evaluation framework based on wraparound literature that was predominantly focused on child welfare and youth justice rather than immigration settlement and did not have any pre-established performance measures or targets to compare data results against. As such, this program evaluation for VIRCS’ NWSP should be considered as a mere starting point; future evaluations of the Program could use the results derived from this exploratory research to inform a more robust, explanatory evaluation framework that could be applied periodically to measure effectiveness and successful program implementation on a continuous basis.

Despite the limitations and delimitations of this study, the information derived from this research has the potential to improve outcomes for highly vulnerable immigrants and refugees enrolled in the NWSP, and may be translated to other contexts within the field of immigration settlement and integration.
# 4.0 Findings: Descriptive Statistical Analysis

## 4.1 Introduction

The data collection methods implemented resulted in a total of 40 surveys and 11 interviews. As such, the following findings are centred on 40 surveys and 11 interviews. Findings are presented in two parts. Part I will focus on the information derived from the evaluation survey, and Part II will provide themes developed from the interview data in order to enable a comprehensive analysis of the results in Chapter 7.

As noted in Chapter 3, the survey was administered to current and former NWSP clients (Groups 1 and 2). Therefore, the following findings do not include information retrieved from the Settlement Team (Group 3).

The results derived from the survey will be presented in the following manner:

- **Descriptive Statistics** – This will include: demographics; the current state of the NWSP; working alliance and fidelity to the wraparound approach; levels of goal attainment and resilience among clients; levels of satisfaction among clients; strengths of the NWSP; and suggestions for improvement.

## 4.2 Questions – Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigration Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Resident</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Resident</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee/Protected Person</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Diagram showing Immigration Status, Country of Origin, and Ethnicity of Survey Respondents](image-url)
Demographic questions inquired about participants’ gender, age, family status, level of education, immigration status, country of origin, and ethnicity. Only 36 participants provided their gender and age, while four preferred not to disclose this information. In total, 61.1% (n=22) of participants who answered these questions identified as female and 38.9% (n=14) identified as male. The age of survey respondents ranged between 23 and 87 years. The average age was 42 years, the median age was 38.5 years, and the modal age was 34 years. All 40 survey respondents provided their family status: 65% (n=26) of participants were married and 70% (n=28) claimed to have children. Only 36 participants provided their education level. Most of the participants were highly educated: 66.7% (n=26) of respondents stated that they had a university degree or some form of certification, while only 5.6% (n=2) stated that they had less than a high-school diploma.

Of the 40 survey respondents, 33 answered the immigration status question: 87.9% (n=30) stated that they were permanent residents, 9.1% (n=3) reported temporary resident status (i.e. student or work visa), and 3% (n=2) stated that they were refugees or protected persons. Of the 40 survey respondents, 36 participants provided their country of origin. In total, 15 different countries of origin were recorded: 47.2% (n=17) of participants originated from China and 8.3% (n=3) originated from Syria (see Figure 6). Other countries of origin included: Algeria, Barbados, England, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Morocco, the Philippines, Senegal, Vietnam, and Rwanda. Only 35 participants provided their ethnicity. The three ethnicities reported were Asian, Black/African, and Middle Eastern. Of the 35 participants who provided their ethnicity, 66.7% (n=26) identified as Asian, 25% (n=10) identified as Black/African, and 8% (n=3) identified as Middle Eastern. For a fulsome illustration of the demographics, please see Appendix D.

### The Current State of the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Meeting</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wraparound Plan</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 7. THE CURRENT STATE OF THE NWSP**

### 4.3 Questions – Current State of NWSP

The current state of the NWSP was captured through a total of five questions that included a combination of both process and outcome evaluation measures influenced by the GAS (Goal Attainment Scale) and the WFI (Wraparound Fidelity Index). Specifically, this section explored whether survey respondents were currently enrolled in the NWSP; the number of monthly meetings clients had with their case manager; whether clients had a wraparound plan; immigration barriers; and their main goals in the NWSP (see Appendix B). Of the 40
survey respondents, 72.5% (n=29) were current NWSP clients and 27.5% (n=11) were former NWSP clients (see Figure 7).

As illustrated in Figure 7, 57.5% (n=23) of the participants reported that they sometimes meet on a monthly basis with their case manager, while 30% (n=12) reported that they always or usually meet on a monthly basis, and 12.5% (n=5) reported that they never meet with their case manager. Furthermore, 70% (n=28) of participants reported that they have a wraparound plan, whereas 30% (n=12) did not have a wraparound plan.

Table 5. Barriers to Settlement and Integration Faced by Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are your barriers to settlement and integration?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t speak English well.</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m having a hard time finding a job in my field of expertise.</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m having a hard time finding a job in general.</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel discriminated against.</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My education isn’t recognized in the workplace.</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t earn enough money to support myself.</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t earn enough money to support my family.</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have all my legal documents.</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I have to change who I am to fit into Canadian society.</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m not interested in finding a job.</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m not interested in becoming a part of my community.</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t understand how things work in Canada (i.e. employment, banking, civic engagement, etc.).</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had bad experiences in my country of origin that are getting in the way of my settlement and integration (i.e. threats against my safety and wellbeing, persecution, trauma, refugee camps).</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered** | 39 |
**Skipped** | 1 |

In question 4 of the survey, participants were asked about their barriers to settlement and integration. Participants were provided with a list displaying common barriers noted in the literature and an opportunity to specify other barriers as well (see Table 5 and Appendix B). On average, participants cited approximately three barriers to settlement and integration. The most common barriers faced by the 39 participants who answered this question were difficulty speaking English and challenges finding a suitable job. Specifically, 51.3% (n=20) of participants stated that they cannot speak English well and 48.7% (n=19) stated that they are having a hard time finding a job. Moreover, 53.8% (n=21) of participants stated that they do not earn enough money to support themselves. In addition, 12.8% (n=5) of participants cited that they feel discriminated against and 28.2% (n=11) explained that they feel compelled to change who they are in order to fit into Canadian society. Furthermore, 5.1% (n=2) stated that difficult experiences in their country of origin were preventing them from properly settling into Canada. Other barriers cited were issues with mental health and poor experiences with immigration services.

The last question in this section asked about participants’ goals in the NWSP. Of the 40 participants, 36 responded, with 41.5% (n=15) stating that their goal was to find a job, 27.5% (n=10) stating that they wished to build a social network, and 25% (n=9) stating that they were hoping to learn English. Notably, 22.5% (n=8) of the participants who answered this question mentioned a causal relationship between the three goals. For example, one participant noted, “I would like to learn English so that I can engage in positive experiences that could help me get a good job,” while another participant stated, “I would like to learn English so that I can get a good job more easily and build community.” In addition, 17.5% (n=6) of participants noted that they wished to acquire their permanent residency or their Canadian citizenship. One participant explained, “I would like to find a good job that can support my family and help us successfully settle into Canadian society without feeling discriminated against or being attacked for our immigration status.”
4.4 Questions – Working Alliance and Fidelity to the Wraparound Approach

Working alliance and fidelity to the wraparound approach were measured through 15 Likert-scale questions influenced by the WAI (Working Alliance Inventory) and WFI (Wraparound Fidelity Index) measures cited in the literature review. The Likert-scale questions ranged between “1=Strongly Disagree” and “5=Strongly Agree.” For a full breakdown of these questions and their associated findings, please refer to Table 6. Note that the neutral answer of “3=Neither Agree nor Disagree” was removed from the illustration, as these data did not add any meaning to the Program’s evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6. WORKING ALLIANCE AND WRAPAROUND FIDELITY MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My experience with the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program has been as described below:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) When I began the Program, I met with a case manager to talk about my needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Some members of my Wraparound Team are people I know, like friends and family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Sometimes I feel like people on my Wraparound Team don’t understand me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) My Wraparound Team respects my culture, ethnicity, religion, values, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) I am happy with my Wraparound Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) I think that my Wraparound Plan will help me settle into Greater Victoria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) My Wraparound Plan tries to help all members of my family as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Some things in my Wraparound Plan don’t make sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) During my Wraparound meetings, I often write down my progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) The Program connects me to services that are really helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) The Program helps solve my problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) The Program has made me feel welcome and safe in Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) I think I will be successful in Canada after I finish the Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) My Wraparound Team and I talked about what I will do after I finish the Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o) I think the Program could end before my needs have been met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answered</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skipped</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 6(b) through 6(e) measured working alliance among the wraparound team. Most participants appeared comfortable and pleased with their wraparound team. Specifically, 57.5% (n=23) of participants stated that some members of their wraparound team consisted of natural supports, such as friends and family. Furthermore, 85% (n=34) of participants agreed that their wraparound team was respectful of their culture, religion, and values, and 85% (n=34) of participants were also generally satisfied with their wraparound team. These results are in accordance with question 6(c), which was included in contrast to question 6(e). In question 6(c), 65% (n=26) of participants disagreed with feeling misunderstood by their wraparound team. Questions 6(a) and 6(f) through 6(m) measured fidelity to the wraparound approach through evaluating the effectiveness...
of the wraparound plan and clients’ perception of the outcomes that would result due to the NWSP (see Table 6). Overall, these findings reveal that 87.5% (n=35) of participants met with a case manager at the beginning of the Program; 82.5% (n=34) of participants believed that their wraparound plan was going to help them settle into Greater Victoria; and 80% (n=32) believed that their wraparound plan was comprehensive of their needs. Furthermore, 57.5% (n=23) claimed to understand their wraparound plan. However, positive responses regarding recording progress during wraparound meetings were not overwhelmingly high, as only 50% (n=20) of participants recorded their progress during wraparound meetings, while 50% (n=20) of participants did not record their progress often or held a neutral opinion.

Most participants believed that the NWSP would result in positive outcomes, as noted in questions 6(j) through 6(m) in Table 6. Specifically, 92.5% (n=37) of participants stated that the Program has connected them to helpful community resources, while 87.5% (n=35) claimed that the Program has helped solve their problems. In addition, 90% (n=36) of participants stated that the Program has made them feel welcome and safe in Canada, and 77.5% (n=32) of participants believed that they will be successful in Canada after the conclusion of the NWSP. Questions 6(n) through 6(o) measured the NWSP’s effectiveness in successfully transitioning participants from the Program, which is also an important component of wraparound fidelity. Herein, 72.5% (n=29) of participants have discussed next steps with their wraparound team after the conclusion of the Program. However, 52.5% (n=20) of participants believed that they may transition from the Program before their needs have been met, potentially indicating a dependency upon the Program or a continued need for immigration and settlement services.

**Levels of Goal Attainment and Resilience among Survey Respondents**

**Table 7. Levels of Goal Attainment and Resilience among Survey Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The NWSP has helped me:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Feel hopeful about my future.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Learn the Canadian banking system.</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Find a job that can support me and my family.</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Find housing that is secure and meets my personal/family needs.</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Participate in programs and activities in my neighbourhood.</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Meet new friends.</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Sort out my immigration documents.</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Organize my medical documents.</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Practice my culture, religion, values, and beliefs without feeling judged.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Go to school or get my foreign education documents recognized.</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered** | 40
**Skipped** | 0

Goal attainment and resilience levels among survey respondents were measured through ten 5-point Likert-scale questions ranging between “1=Strongly Disagree” and “5=Strongly Agree.” For a full breakdown of these questions and their associated findings, please refer to Table 7. Note that the neutral answer of “3=Neither Agree nor Disagree” was removed from the illustration, as these data did not add any meaning to
the Program’s evaluation. Most of the questions in this measure were influenced by the GAS (Goal Attainment Scaling) and PRYM (Pathways to Youth Resilience Measure). Measures from PRYM were adapted for adults.

Questions 7(b), 7(c), 7(d), 7(g), 7(h), and 7(j) measured clients’ level of goal attainment (see Table 7). Herein, 67.5% (n=27) of participants noted that the NWSP has helped them learn the Canadian banking system; 60% (n=24) of participants stated that the Program has helped them find a suitable job; and 55% (n=22) of participants stated that the NWSP has helped them find safe and secure housing. Over half of the participants also stated that the Program has helped them with their immigration, medical, and educational documents. For example, 60% (n=24) of participants stated that the NWSP has helped them with their immigration documents; 57.5% (n=23) of participants stated that the Program has helped them organize their medical documents; and 67.5% (n=27) of participants reported that the Program has helped them go to school or acquire recognition for their foreign education documents. Each of these questions derived from the GAS and the broader literature theorizing that positive outcomes can be indicative of high levels of goal attainment (see Bruns et al., 2004; Bickman et al., 2003; Debicki et al., 2012; Shailer et al., 2017; Walker & Schutte, 2004).

Questions 7(a), 7(e), 7(f), and 7(i) measured clients’ level of resilience (see Table 7). Herein, 90% (n=36) of participants stated that the NWSP has helped them feel hopeful about the future; 85% (n=34) of participants stated that the Program has helped them meet new friends; 80% (n=32) claimed that the NWSP has helped them practice their culture, religion, values, and beliefs without feeling judged; and 82.5% (n=33) stated that the Program has helped them become active members of their community.

**Levels of Satisfaction Among Survey Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The following describes my satisfaction with the NWSP:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongly Disagree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) I am satisfied with the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I am satisfied with the progress I have made since starting the Program.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Since starting the Program, I began to meet my needs.</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Since starting the Program, I feel like things have improved.</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answered</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skipped</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of satisfaction among survey respondents were measured through four 5-point Likert scale questions derived from the YFIT (Youth and Family Involvement in Teams) measure. Overall, survey respondents appeared fairly satisfied with the Program (see Table 8). As noted in Table 8, 87.5% (n=35) of participants stated that they were satisfied with the NWSP, and 80% (n=32) of participants stated that they were satisfied with the progress they have made since starting the Program. In addition, 82.5% (n=33) of participants stated that the Program has helped them meet their needs, and 82.5% (n=33) of survey respondents stated that they believe their circumstances have improved since starting the Program.

**4.5 Questions – Strengths of the NWSP and Suggestions for Improvement**

In the final section of the survey, participants were encouraged to describe their favourite part about the NWSP and provide suggestions for improvement. Only 16 participants described their favourite part about the Program, and 26 participants provided suggestions for improvement.
STRENGTHS OF THE NWSP

Of the 16 participants who disclosed their favourite part about the NWSP, 30.8% (n=6) stated that the Program is goal oriented; 30.8% (n=6) stated that the Program has a welcoming and supportive environment; and 26.9% (n=4) noted that the Program has dedicated case managers. To illustrate goal orientation, one participant explained, “I appreciate how the Program is working hard to help me find a good job,” while another participant stated, “My favourite part is the Program’s willingness to help newcomers learn English and find a good job, in addition to being a good support system.” Another participant noted, “I appreciate how everyone is so welcoming, and individuals receive help that matches their needs without feeling judged.” With respect to dedicated case managers, participants have commented on the kindness, attention, and unconditional service they received from their case manager. For example, one participant stated, “My case manager is so kind to me and my family. This makes me very comfortable and ready to reach for the impossible.” An other participant commented, “I can talk to my case manager openly and trust her 100%. I feel safe and can talk to her any time I need to.” Other highlights noted about the Program included the Program’s ability to help others, the workshops and different activities available, and opportunities to build community.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Of the 26 participants who provided suggestions for improvement, 46% (n=12) discussed the need to provide more information about systems of operation in Canada; 27% (n=7) suggested hosting more events and activities; and 27% (n=7) mentioned the need for more resources. For example, two participants noted that they would like to learn about women’s rights and interests in Canada, while another participant noted that he would like to receive more banking information, in addition to information about Canada in general, such as current events, history, and cultural nuances. Two participants suggested hosting events that highlight the community’s local culture and provide newcomers with an opportunity to connect with the community. With respect to the need for more resources, participants have cited hosting more workshops, such as cooking classes, information about banking, citizenship application, and employment skills training. One participant stated, “Employees need to be equipped with more resources in order to enhance their quality of service. Talking is cheap. However, there is never any action.” Another participant stated, “Case managers should strive to understand each client on an individual basis, instead of assuming that the entire wraparound team has the same goals.”
In total, 40 NWSP clients participated in the survey; 29 of the participants (72.5%) were enrolled in the NWSP at the time of data collection and 11 of the participants (27.5%) were former clients.

The most common barriers to settlement and integration were difficulty speaking English and challenges finding a suitable job. Specifically, 51.3% (n=20) of participants stated that they cannot speak English well and 48.7% (n=19) stated that they are having a hard time finding a job.

Of the 36 participants who shared their settlement goals, 41.5% (n=15) stated that they were hoping to find a job, 27.5% (n=10) wished to build a social network, and 25% (n=9) wanted to learn English. In addition, 17.5% (n=6) of participants wished to acquire their permanent residency or their Canadian citizenship.

When measuring clients’ experiences with the NWSP, over half of the participants (85%; n=34) stated that they are happy with their wraparound team, and over half of the participants (76.5%; n=31) believed that they will be successful in Canada after the Program. Most participants agreed with the statements that:

- Some members of their Wraparound team are people they know (57.5%; n=23);
- Their wraparound team respects their culture, ethnicity, and religion (85%; n=34);
- Their wraparound plan will help them settle into greater Victoria (82.5%; n=33);
- Their wraparound plan helps all members of their family as necessary (80%; n=32);
- The NWSP connects them to services that are really helpful (92.5%; n=37);
- The NWSP helps solve their problems (87.5%; n=35); and
- The NWSP has made them feel welcome and safe in Canada (90%; n=36).

When measuring clients’ goal achievement, most participants stated that the NWSP has helped them:

- Feel hopeful about their future (90%; n=36);
- Find a suitable job (70%; n=24);
- Learn the Canadian banking system (68%; n=27);
- Find suitable housing (55%; n=22);
- Become an active member of their community (82.5%; n=33);
- Meet new friends (84.5%; n=34);
- Practice their culture, values, religion, and beliefs without feeling judged (80%; n=32); and
- Go to school or have their foreign education documents recognized (67.5%; n=17).

Overall, survey respondents appeared fairly satisfied with the Program: 87.5% (n=35) of participants stated that they were satisfied with the NWSP, and 80% of participants stated that they were satisfied with the progress they have made since starting the Program. In addition, 82.5% (n=32) of participants stated that the Program has helped them meet their needs, and 82.5% (n=32) of survey respondents stated that they believe their circumstances have improved since starting the Program.

Of the 16 participants who disclosed their favourite part about the NWSP, 30.8% (n=6) stated that the Program is goal oriented; 30.8% (n=6) stated that the Program has a welcoming and supportive environment; and 26.9% (n=4) noted that the Program has dedicated case managers. Of the 26 participants who provided suggestions for improvement, 46% (n=12) discussed the need to provide more information about systems of operation in Canada; 27% (n=7) suggested hosting more events and activities; and 27% (n=7) mentioned the need for more resources.
5.0 Findings: Groups 1 and 2 Interviews

As noted in Chapter 3, survey respondents were invited to participate in 30 to 45 minute open-ended, semi-structured interviews. The Settlement Team was also invited to participate in key-informant interviews. In total, there were five interviews conducted with current and former NWSP clients (Groups 1 and 2) and six interviews conducted with the Settlement Team (Group 3 – see following chapter).

5.1 Introduction: Groups 1 and 2 Interview Findings

**Group 1: Current Clients** – Current clients were interviewed because they were essential for answering the main research question of this study: To what extent, if any, does VIRCS’ NWSP effectively help newcomers to Canada navigate overwhelming or complex barriers toward settlement and integration in Greater Victoria? It was assumed that current clients’ feedback and perceptions could provide information about the present state of the Program and aspects that are working well in addition to those that could be improved. This information was necessary to obtain, as it would be vital for informing potential recommendations for improvement, given that current clients are the most aware of any shortcomings that may exist from the service receiver perspective.

**Group 2: Past Clients** – Former clients of a program have the ability to share information about any progress that they have made since entering the program, in addition to any shortcomings they may have faced while receiving services. As such, engaging this Group in the research was essential for examining the longitudinal effects of the NWSP. While all of the participants interviewed were enrolled in the NWSP at the time of data collection, some participants have been clients for several years and seldom visited VIRCS, given that their circumstances have improved. As such, these individuals fulfilled the desire of interviewing former clients to a limited extent.

For the remainder of this section, interview participants from Groups 1 and 2 will be referred to via their pseudonyms: Participant G1/2I1; Participant G1/2I2; Participant G1/2I3; Participant G1/2I4; and Participant G1/2I5. In addition to a number of open-ended questions, participants from Groups 1 and 2 were asked the same demographic questions presented in the survey. In total, 80% (n=4) of participants were female and 20% (n=1) were male. Their ages ranged between 23 and 56 years, with the average age of 37 years. Furthermore, 60% (n=3) of participants were Black/African and 40% (n=2) were Asian, while 40% (n=2) were permanent residents, 20% (n=1) were refugees/protected persons, 20% (n=1) were temporary residents, and 20% (n=1) did not have an immigration status. Countries of origin included England, India, Rwanda, and Senegal. Although most of the themes that emerged in the interviews echoed the findings in Part I, participants were given the opportunity to explore what worked for them, what could have been better, and how they believe the NWSP could be improved for newcomers.

In total, five themes emerged from the interviews conducted with Groups 1 and 2:

- Immigration History;
- Reasons for Accessing the NWSP;
- Internal Success Factors for Integration and Settlement;
- Strengths of the NWSP; and
- Opportunities for Improvement.

5.2 Immigration History

For the purpose of this project, immigration history will be defined as a series of past events that have resulted in a participant’s choice to immigrate to Canada. Many of the participants provided their immigration story at the beginning of the interview. This information has become the foundation of the interviews and outlines some newcomers’ experiences in Canada that are not regularly discussed. Consequently, their stories will be highlighted in this section (see Figure 8).
5.3 Reasons for Accessing the NWSP

While 60% (n=3) of the participants approached VIRCS due to the traumatic events that ensued from their immigration history, there were three main components that were provided as the reason for accessing the NWSP: (1) 80% (n=4) of participants noted issues with immigration documents; (2) 60% (n=3) stated that they were seeking to learn English or searching for employment and housing; and (3) 80% (n=4) mentioned receiving an external recommendation.

**Issues with Immigration Documents**

The most commonly cited reason for accessing the NWSP was issues with immigration documents. According to Participant G1/2I1, the incident that brought him to VIRCS was meeting a girl in Canada, which led to a series of immigration issues. The participant explained that, “It started out as a casual, consensual relationship. Everything was going fine at first. However, this girl had a boyfriend, who found out about me. One night when I called her, it sounded like she was with her boyfriend, but I felt like I had no right to ask any questions...One day, campus security called me into their office to question me about a complaint this girl made against me...Campus Security told me not to contact her anymore and everything would be okay...Two weeks later, Campus Security called me to a room where there were two police officers waiting for me. These officers confirmed my name and told me that I was under arrest. I was so shocked. The officers explained that I was charged with criminal harassment. However, I told the officers my entire story and that the school assured me everything would be okay if I left the girl alone and didn't contact her anymore. The officers just told me that I have a right to remain silent, and that anything I say could be used against me.”

~Participant G1/2I1

“I failed to show up to an interview hearing because I was unable to find someone to look after my children. As a result, Victoria Police and CBSA showed up at my house. I was arrested in front of my children, shackled, handcuffed, and transported to a women’s institution on Vancouver Island. When I complained about the shackles hurting my ankles, one of the CBSA officers told me to shut up. When we arrived to the prison, I was body searched and placed into solitary confinement for four days without any undergarments.”

~Participant G1/2I4

**FIGURE 8. QUOTES HIGHLIGHTING INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS’ IMMIGRATION HISTORY**
there were two police officers waiting for me. These officers confirmed my name… and explained that I was charged with criminal harassment…I was also placed on academic probation.”

The participant stated that his case was eventually dismissed; however, CBSA ceased his passport during the investigation because he was violating the conditions of his student visa, given that he was not attending school, as per the orders of the police and campus security. In turn, the participant stated that he entered a state of depression, “The day my passport was seized, I actually thought about suicide. When I received my suspension letter, the school gave me a letter with suicidal help lines attached, and I was beginning to wonder whether they were secretly trying to motivate me to commit suicide.” Consequently, Participant G1/2I1 accessed VIRCS in order to have his suspension letter lifted so that he could return to school to finish his postgraduate diploma and retrieve his passport from CBSA. He was also seeking to be in a place where he did not feel judged and emotionally distraught.

Participant G1/2I4 stated that she accessed VIRCS because she would like to acquire her permanent residency. According to the participant, “When I decided to try and stay in Canada, I did not want to apply for Refugee Status on Humanitarian and Compassionate Grounds. However, CBSA told me that I had to apply for a refugee claim. I told them I could not submit a refugee claim because I traveled to Canada from France. France is a safe country and does not qualify for refugee applications in Canada. CBSA told my immigration consultant that if I did not apply for a refugee claim specifically, I would be deported.” The participant explained that after she applied for refugee status, her application was rejected almost immediately. For the past two and a half years, the participant has been striving to remain in Canada on legal grounds, but is often faced by roadblocks, “I have a lot to say about Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada. Sincerely, I never thought that immigrating to Canada would be so difficult, especially when I have a Canadian child. He is three and a half years old. Canada is his country, his home. So, I don't understand why they want to separate him from his country. CBSA is treating me like a criminal. I am not a criminal. I came here legally and now I would like to remain here. I've been working two jobs to support myself and my family in an honest way.” Overall, the participant accessed VIRCS because she was seeking for help regarding the submission of a refugee claim, and she has been receiving ongoing services from VIRCS for the past two and a half years, as she strives to remain in Canada and acquire her permanent residency.

Participants G1/2I2 and G1/2I5 also noted that they initially accessed VIRCS because they were seeking for help with their immigration documents. Participant G1/2I2 stated, “I came to VIRCS to ask for help because I didn't know how to apply for Refugee Status to remain in Canada.” Participant G1/2I5 explained, “I have to renew my passport. VIRCS has also been helping me with applying for my Canadian citizenship. My goal is to get my citizenship and find new housing.”

**Employment, Housing, and English**

While 80% (n=4) of the participants initially accessed VIRCS due to issues with immigration documents, 60% (n=3) have remained clients to receive assistance with employment, housing, and learning English. Participants G1/2I1 and G1/2I2 stated that they would like to return to school in order to acquire a suitable job. Participant G1/2I5 noted that one of her main goals within the Program was to find new housing, “I was living on my own, then I got sick, then I was placed in a group home. I've been on my own for 17 to 18 years, so it is difficult to share a home with others now. I applied to get new housing in another region. I am under a lot of stress in my current living situation.” Participant G1/2I3 stated, “I accessed VIRCS because I needed help to find a job and housing.” Participant G1/2I3 also stated that she was hoping to improve her English. Similarly, Participant G1/2I4 explained, “When I came here, I didn't know anybody, except a member of my family. It was very hard for me when I first came to Canada because I did not speak, understand, or read English. It was dreadful. I had to go to school to take some English classes at VIRCS. I did this for one and a half years. I also volunteered as a French translator, but learning a new language was very tough.”
EXTERNAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Although many participants accessed VIRCS in search of help regarding their various needs, it is important to note that 80% (n=4) of interview participants initially learned about VIRCS through external recommendations. For example, Participant G1/2I1 stated, “I was told that I could seek legal help, but there was no legal aid available for me because the police did not file anything against me. I was in a state of shock; I did not know what to do. When I engaged with Correction Services Canada, one of the corrections officers informed me about the University of Victoria’s legal clinic. The legal clinic listened to my story and accepted my case. One of the law students also suggested that VIRCS may have additional resources to help me, or at least provide emotional support. Before this, I did not even know that VIRCS existed.” Participant G1/2I3 stated, “I came to VIRCS because I am new to Canada and I heard that VIRCS helps immigrants. I know a girl who is a client at VIRCS and she told me about the organization. She said that VIRCS has helped her get a job because it is well connected in the community, so I decided to access the organization for help.” Participants G1/2I4 and G1/2I5 also noted that they learned about VIRCS through a community connection.

5.4 Behavioural Success Factors for Integration and Settlement

Another common theme that emerged from the interviews was premised on behavioural success factors that helped NWSP clients face their immigration and settlement barriers. For the purpose of this project, behavioural success factors will be defined in accordance with the locus of control. The locus of control is defined as a personality trait referred to an individual’s perception of the locus of events as internally determined by his or her own behaviour versus fate, chance, or external circumstances (Sagone & De Caroli, 2014, p. 222). The concept has derived from Social Learning Theory and is a belief about whether the outcomes of people’s actions are contingent on what they do (internal control orientation), or on events outside their personal control (external control orientation) (Sagone & De Caroli, 2012, p. 222). Internality refers to the expectancy that one is in control of obtaining rewards from one’s environment, while externality refers to the belief that rewards are out of one’s control and determined by chance. Reciprocity is an example of an external locus of control and resilience is an example of an internal locus of control, as defined later. Reciprocity and resilience were both common factors present among interview participants.

RECIROCITY

According to Falk and Fischbacher (2003), reciprocity is a behavioural response to perceived kindness and unkindness, where kindness comprises both distributional fairness and underlying intentions (p. 294). Reciprocity is a behaviour that cannot be justified in terms of selfish and purely outcome-oriented preferences (Falk & Fischbacher, 2003, p. 294). Individuals with a high level of reciprocity will be compelled to impart the kindness they have received from others among people in circumstances similar to their own. As such, reciprocity can be perceived as an example of an external locus of control, given that individuals with high levels of reciprocity attribute their success to external factors and aspire to pay it forward.

All five interview participants have expressed their gratitude toward VIRCS through examples of reciprocity. According to Participant G1/2I1, “VIRCS has helped me so much that I want to give back, I want to volunteer at VIRCS and help other newcomers integrate into Canadian society. They have already done a lot for me and now I want to do something for them.” Participant G1/2I2 stated, “I would like to go back to school and help others in the immigration process. I know how tough everything was for me when I first came here, so I understand how hard it is for someone else. My goal is to help someone settle and feel much better, wherever I can. I'd like to volunteer at VIRCS. I always try to be there however I can help.” Participant G1/2I3 expressed, “VIRCS is able to turn any situation into a positive outcome. I am always able to think more clearly than before after my check-in with my case manager. I find that now I can use my experience to help other newcomers.” Participant G1/2I4 also stated that she volunteered at VIRCS in order to help others, and Participant G1/2I5 expressed her desire to, “Set up a charity, where you can give a little bit of money for people who need it, who are hungry and can't afford a meal, just a little something that we can do. I was going to ask my case manager to help me with this.”
**RESILIENCE**

As noted in the literature review, resilience has been commonly defined as an internal trait reflecting a relatively stable trajectory of healthy functioning across time and exposures (Keles, Friborg, Idsoe, Sirin, & Opedal, 2018, p. 53). Resilience has also been defined as a dynamic process resulting in positive adaptation in the presence of significant adversity (Keles *et al.*, 2018, p. 53). As such, resilience can be perceived as an example of an internal locus of control, given that individuals with high levels of resilience hold themselves accountable for remaining positive and achieving desirable outcomes when faced with hardship.

In addition to reciprocity, 60% (n=3) of interview participants have exhibited signs of resilience when describing their newcomer experiences. When reflecting on his circumstance, Participant G1/2I1 stated, “My mother always taught me to respect women. After this, I still respect women. There was a female legal aid helping me with my case and she asked me what I think of Canada now that I have gone through this experience. I said that things happen to people, but it doesn't mean that I should blame all of Canada or the entire immigration system. Nothing is perfect. I still want to live here, this was just a bad episode of my life, but I am glad there are avenues for me to pursue justice.” Participant G1/2I4 noted that VIRCS has connected her with a counsellor who has helped her become stronger internally and plead her case with confidence when she appeared before the Immigration and Refugee Board. With respect to her situation, Participant G1/2I5 stated, “I just try to laugh and enjoy life no matter what. I will keep fighting, I will not give up. I hang out with my friends and family, and I try to find joy in the little things. I am so sick of it all, but I keep going. I keep laughing and spending time with my friends and family. This work can’t all be for nothing. The Settlement Team fought for me, I fought for myself. Each person brought something to the table to fight my case. I am thankful to have VIRCS and to know VIRCS.”

**5.5 Strengths of the NWSP**

In addition to providing their immigration history and discussing barriers to settlement and integration, participants were asked to describe their favourite part about the NWSP. This portion of the interviews resulted in a number of factors that participants perceived as strengths of the Program, particularly: (1) creating a sense of belonging; (2) providing diverse and flexible services; (3) exhibiting strong working alliance and having culturally competent case managers; (4) being goal-oriented; and (5) generating high levels of overall satisfaction among clients.

**SENSE OF BELONGING**

When participants were asked about their favourite part regarding the NWSP, 100% (n=5) mentioned having a place that offers unconditional support without judgement as a strength. Participant G1/2I1 stated, “My case manager has become a big brother to me, always supporting me and giving me relevant advice. Even having someone to listen to me and have an active conversation with me without any judgement helps.” Participant G1/2I2 stated, “When I first came to VIRCS, I didn't have a home because it wasn’t safe for me to return. I was here as a student, and I didn't know what to do after my student visa expired. Not being able to return to my own country was really difficult for me. However, when VIRCS began helping me with my refugee application, things changed, especially after I was approved to remain in Canada. Suddenly, I had a home again, in which I could feel safe. Being away from my family is not easy, but VIRCS has become my second home.” Participant G1/2I3 noted, “VIRCS is like a home, it reaches beyond my case manager. Everyone within the Program is like a second family to me. I really like how welcoming this Program is of everyone who faces barriers to settlement and integration.”

Even when VIRCS was unable to help solve all of their problems, participants commented on how grateful they were to have a place that they could call home in a foreign world. Participant G1/2I4 stated, “I occasionally feel judged in Canada, for the way I dress and for the way I live my life. I don’t necessarily know if these barriers will ever improve. However, I never met someone at VIRCS who judges me on any basis, religion, dress, etcetera. I went through a lot of hardships as a newcomer, but I feel that VIRCS was there for
me. VIRCS has become my family, and my little one grew up at VIRCS…we celebrated his first birthday there. The Settlement Team has become our family.” Similarly, Participant G1/2I5 stated, “I still struggle…I have a lot of health issues that I am dealing with. However, all the people here are very friendly, and they treat me so well. The Settlement Team is always filled with smiles, never any anger. I just love the atmosphere! When I make an appointment to come here, I am so excited. I get my bag and get ready to go. I love to come here, and I get so sad when I have to leave, because it’s like saying goodbye to family.”

**Diverse and Flexible Services**

In addition to feeling at home, 100% (n=5) of the participants also mentioned the availability of diverse and flexible services as a strength of the NWSP. Participants admitted that VIRCS’ ability to connect them to appropriate community resources, including counsellors and lawyers, conduct useful workshops, and offer childcare services, food stamps, and bus passes were very useful in helping them face their barriers to settlement and integration. For example, Participant G1/2I1 noted, “There were times when I struggled financially; my bus pass was cancelled and I couldn't work more than 20 hours, so VIRCS gave me bus passes and free food. My case manager also connected me with services at VIRCS that help immigrants file their tax forms, and he organized therapy sessions for me…I am so overwhelmed with everything this organization has done to help me. Seriously, I would not have expected a therapist, bus passes, food…now I truly understand the value of therapy, and I am so thankful that VIRCS helped me acquire these services.” Similarly, Participant G1/2I2 noted, “VIRCS connected me with a counsellor, who I used to see regularly, just to talk, just to have someone I could talk to and feel supported by. VIRCS also helped me acquire an immigration lawyer, who helped me apply for refugee status.” Participant G1/2I3 emphasized VIRCS’ ability to help her find a suitable job and learn English, “The advice and community resources I was connected to helped me get two jobs, and I was able to learn English, and become a Canadian citizen.”

Participant G1/2I4 further highlighted the NWSP’s ability to wrap clients with various services, as she shared, “VIRCS helped me apply for refugee status, appeal the rejection, and subsequently apply for judicial review once the appeal was dismissed…we had two wins since then…VIRCS also helped me get released from prison so that I could care for my children, and it partnered with another non-profit organization in the community to enhance our ability to defend my case. In addition, VIRCS connected me with a program that explains how to apply for Canadian citizenship as a newcomer and how to acquire social assistance, daycare, bus tickets, and so forth.” When asked whether these resources were helping her meet her needs in Canada, the participant explained, “Yes, the nightmare I have lived since I came from France has become more manageable.”

Discussions regarding wraparound fidelity also revealed the flexibility of the NWSP and its ability to meet people where they were at. Participant G1/2I1 noted, “My case is completely different from general integration and settlement barriers that case managers deal with at VIRCS. Even though I was not entirely able to disclose everything to my case manager, he still tried to help me to the best of his abilities.” When explaining how often they met with their case manager, each participant stated that the frequency of meetings with their case manager was dependent on the gravity of their circumstance. When participants were faced with more serious hardships, they would meet with their case manager more often than normal. Participant G1/2I1 noted, “The frequency of meetings with my case manager really depends on my needs. In the beginning, we used to meet once or twice a week, but sometimes we’ll meet only once or twice a month. It all depends on how my case is progressing or if I need any help in other areas of settlement.” Similarly, Participant G1/2I2 stated, “I don't see my case manager as often as I used to, because now I have my refugee status, so my greatest barrier has been met, but if anything comes up, I go more often.” Participant G1/2I3 explained, “We meet once or twice a week; it depends on how urgent my needs are. When I was getting my permanent residency, I met with my case manager more often to fill out paperwork and such. Right now, we don't meet as often as we used to, but whenever I need help with something, I just call my case manager and he'll answer right away.”

**Strong Working Alliance and Culturally Competent Case Managers**

Another strength of the NWSP was having a strong working alliance generated by the wraparound team, as noted by 100% (n=5) of interview participants, and having culturally competent case managers, as noted by
60% (n=3) of interview participants. Specifically, participants appeared grateful for their case manager’s ability to connect with them on a human level and use relevant resources to help them in any way possible. Participants were also grateful for their case manager’s compassion, genuine devotion to their needs, and ability to care for them without expecting anything in return. Participant G1/2I1 explained, “VIRCS has helped me a lot. When there was no one, my case manager was there for me, talking to me, motivating me, cheering me on, telling me that I was doing well. My case manager coordinated with everyone, using all of his resources to help me...my case manager is very supportive and motivating. I can tell him anything...my favourite part about this Program has been meeting my case manager.” Participant G1/2I2 stated, “My case manager is very involved, and is always motivating me to reach my goals. If there is ever anything that I need help with, my case manager is always the first person I go to see. My case manager is always ready to listen and willing to help as best as possible.” Participant G1/2I3 stated that her case manager and a few other members of the Settlement Team have contributed to significant changes in her life, given that VIRCS has played a very important role in her settlement process.

Participant G1/2I4 explained that she had to learn how to trust people in Canada after her encounters with CBSA, “Trusting VIRCS, my case manager, and the Executive Director was very hard for me in the beginning, because I didn't know if they were good people or my enemies. I was struggling to figure it out at first. However, with time, I began to understand that they are good, they have my back... and others on my wraparound team are amazing. They care, they are warm toward me, and they are compassionate. This is really important to me, especially since I came here by myself. Meeting people who care about me and are trying to genuinely help me is so encouraging. The things VIRCS has done for me have left me speechless.” Finally, Participant G1/2I5 expressed, “My case manager is very kind and is always willing to help other people, before doing his own work. My case manager always puts others first, and is a very funny person, always cheerful, like a big teddy bear...I will never leave my case manager because I really need him.”

In addition to their case manager’s kindness, devotion, and attention, 60% (n=3) of participants expressed appreciation for VIRCS’ ability to understand their circumstance. Participant G1/2I2 noted, “My favourite part is that VIRCS understands every situation that I am going through. As someone who is not from here, it is so hard to communicate with Canadians in an effective way. However, VIRCS has a really strong grasp on this concept, and tries its best to ensure that I am understood. I never leave feeling misunderstood or insignificant. VIRCS is so good at connecting me to the community resources I need to integrate well.” Similarly, Participant G1/2I3 stated, “The Program has made me feel positive and hopeful about my future. VIRCS has a very strong team of people capable of helping newcomers, because they really try to understand each person individually.” Finally, Participant G1/2I4 highlighted their case manager’s ability to relate to their situation due to lived experience, “My case manager understands what I am going through because he was a refugee at one point, which is why he tries so hard to help me and others like me.”

**SUCCESSFUL GOAL ATTAINMENT**

The information that the interview participants have shared with the researcher also highlighted the NWSP’s commitment to helping their clients achieve their goals, regardless of how difficult the situation may be. Specifically, 100% (n=5) of interview participants commented on their wraparound team’s willingness to help them succeed. When Participant G1/2I1 received a suspension letter from his college due to the sexual harassment charge, his case manager used the policies of the institution to demand that he be treated fairly in this circumstance by having full disclosure to the charges made against him and receiving a chance to defend himself. Participant G1/2I2 explained that after she applied for refugee status, VIRCS connected her with an immigration lawyer. However, this immigration lawyer was too busy to fully devote his attention to her case. Participant G1/2I2 explained, “I was so stressed because of my lawyer, so my case manager helped me find a different one. This new lawyer and my counsellor helped me become a little bit stronger than I was before, so I could confidently answer questions during my hearing. I am so grateful for my case manager, because he immediately began addressing my needs.” Similarly, Participant G1/2I5 noted, “I like the quick thinking. They are so responsive to anything I need. My case manager is so quick. He doesn't waste any time.”
Participant G1/2I3 also explained, “I've been at VIRCS for three years now. I've been able to get a job, participate in some English classes, and acquire my citizenship. I am also a member of the African Heritage Association of Vancouver Island, where I get to interact with people and get to know others. Now I am working toward sponsoring my family to Canada, and VIRCS is helping me.” In addition, when Participant G1/2I4 was arrested due to missing her immigration hearing, VIRCS arranged for childcare until she was released from prison. VIRCS has also partnered with legal counsel to copiously plead her case until she can legally acquire her permanent resident card. These findings suggest that VIRCS is a goal-oriented organization that is well connected with community resources and can knowledgeably call upon appropriate institutions to help its clients achieve their goals.

Overall Client Satisfaction

The Program’s commitment and devotion to clients appears to have resulted in high levels of satisfaction among all five interview participants. Participant G1/2I1 stated, “Ultimately, I am really thankful for VIRCS. I don’t know what I would have done without it...I am overwhelmed by how much they were able to help me.” Participants G1/2I2 and G1/2I3 expressed their gratitude by explaining that they did not have any recommendations for improvement, given that they were very satisfied with the Program, specifically its ability to connect with others and its tireless efforts to help newcomers in need. Participant G1/2I4 shared, “I highly recommend VIRCS to people, because they helped me a lot. If they could help me, they can help anybody. VIRCS staff care so much and they will try to help, until they no longer can. VIRCS staff are only human. I just wanted to clarify that they are good. I was a client here for many years, so I know the staff, and how hard they try to make things better for their clients. I think if I didn't know VIRCS, I probably would have died with my two kids.” Finally, Participant G1/2I5 stated that she would encourage newcomers to, “Come to VIRCS because they are the best in the world and they help you a lot. They will help you and you will be so happy you came to VIRCS. Don't go anywhere else, because they won't help you like VIRCS.”

5.6 Opportunities for Improvement

In addition to describing their favourite part about the NWSP, interview participants were asked whether they had any suggestions for improvement. Although participants generally stated that they were very satisfied with the services they received through the NWSP, the two suggestions that emerged were for a greater variety of service providers and workshops, and the potential need for higher wraparound fidelity measures.

Greater Variety of Service Providers and Workshops

Despite the diversity of services noted as a strength of the NWSP, 40% (n=2) of participants explained that VIRCS needed a greater variety of service providers and workshops in order to better respond to the needs of newcomers. Participant G1/2I4 stated, “I wish VIRCS had more lawyers. Good lawyers are needed. They can help with cases like mine. Lawyers are almost a necessity at VIRCS, because the organization is an immigration centre that works a lot with refugee sponsorship, so lawyers can make this process more effective.
Good and honest lawyers, who care and don't give up even when the case is hard.” Participant G1/2I4 expressed, “The government needs to support VIRCS more, to help the organization grow and improve services for clients in the future. VIRCS needs more funds. If VIRCS had more funds, it could help people more. Not only could it hire effective lawyers, but it could also build an emergency fund in order to help clients in case something unexpected happened to them.” Similarly, Participant G1/2I5 stated, “VIRCS needs more funds to hire English teachers for people who can't understand the English language. They also need more activities for kids, like an outdoor playground.” Participant G1/2I2 suggested that VIRCS provide more volunteer opportunities for people who wish to help whenever they have the time.

**Stronger Fidelity to the Wraparound Approach**

When participants were presented with wraparound fidelity questions, such as whether they felt comfortable with their wraparound plan, how often they met with their case manager, and whether they recorded their progress during wraparound meetings, it became evident that the NWSP did not adhere to formal wraparound fidelity processes among these participants. For example, 100% (n=5) of the participants did not fully understand the meaning of a wraparound plan, albeit the researcher provided the definition of this term. Participant G1/2I1 explained, “My case manager always considered the circumstances and evaluated our responses thus far to plan for the future, but I wouldn't say we adhered to a strict wraparound plan.” Participants G1/2I2, G1/2I3, and G1/2I4 explained that they never created a wraparound plan with their case manager. However, once participants understood the meaning of a wraparound plan, 60% (n=3) stated that it would be a useful tool to have in the future. For example, Participant G1/2I3 explained, “My initial experiences at VIRCS have been very casual. However, I would like to sponsor my family to immigrate to Canada as well, so I think that having a formal wraparound plan would be very useful in this process.”

In addition, each of the participants stated that they did not have any scheduled meetings with their case manager, and none of the participants recorded their progress during wraparound meetings. Rather, participants described their meetings as very casual, although this was an aspect they appeared to appreciate. For example, Participant G1/2I5 stated, “We often reflect on my progress and talk about my current needs…I quite enjoy these chats.” Participant G1/2I1 explained, “My case has been kind of chaotic, so we didn't really have time to engage in any reflections. But when this is all over and I go back to school, I think it will be useful for us to participate in something like this. Hopefully we can also reflect on this case and laugh about what happened. But until this is done, I can't think of engaging in something formal like that.” Participant G1/2I4 stated that she does not formally reflect on her progress during wraparound meetings because her case is so reactive to addressing the issues constantly raised with immigration services. However, she explained that her case manager will stop by her place to check-in, “Sometimes my case manager will do home checks to ensure that we are okay and the plans we've chosen to implement are working. He will ask me if everything is okay and if I am satisfied. He checks in quite often.” Given these findings, a potential opportunity for improvement for the NWSP could be a stronger adherence to the four phases and ten principles of the wraparound approach. Nevertheless, deviating from wraparound fidelity measures did not appear to have a negative impact among participants’ overall satisfaction, resilience, and goal attainment.
Summary: Groups 1 and 2 Interview Findings

Five 30 to 45 minute interviews were conducted with current and former NWSP clients. Participants were given an opportunity to explore what worked for them, what could have been better, and how they believe the NWSP could be improved for newcomers.

Five key themes emerged from these findings: (1) Immigration History; (2) Reasons for Accessing the NWSP; (3) Behavioural Success Factors for Integration and Settlement; (4) Strengths of the NWSP; and (5) Opportunities for Improvement.

Of the five interview participants, four immigrated to Canada on temporary visas. Of these four participants, three have remained in Canada due to traumatic circumstances, such as becoming a stateless person, conflict with immigration services, or being accused of a crime.

With respect to accessing VIRCS, 80% (n=4) noted issues with immigration documents as the reason for approaching the organization; 60% (n=3) stated that they were seeking to learn English or searching for employment and housing; and 80% (n=4) mentioned receiving an external recommendation.

Reciprocity and resilience were common behavioural traits among interview participants that helped them manage barriers to settlement and integration.

Factors that participants perceived as strengths of the NWSP include: (1) creating a sense of belonging; (2) providing diverse and flexible services; (3) exhibiting strong working alliance and having culturally competent case managers; (4) being goal-oriented; and (5) generating high-levels of overall satisfaction among clients.

The two suggestions for improvement that derived from the interview findings were a need for greater variety of service providers and workshops and stronger adherence to wraparound fidelity.
6.0 Findings: Group 3 Interviews

In addition to interviews with current and former clients of the NWSP, six key-informant interviews were conducted with members of VIRCS’ Settlement Team. Members of the Settlement Team deliver the NWSP. Therefore, their feedback and perceptions was also essential for answering the main research question and secondary research questions from a service provider perspective. For the remainder of this Chapter, participants from Group 3 will be referred to by their pseudonyms: Participant G3I1; Participant G3I2; Participant G3I3; Participant G3I4; Participant G3I5; and Participant G3I6. Demographic information was not collected for these participants in order to protect their identity. As noted in Chapter 3, the interview guide for the Settlement Team explored participants’ perceptions of the NWSP in relation to client satisfaction, funding, resources, working alliance, and the Program’s ability to help achieve its goals.

In total, five key themes derived from the interview findings:
- Immigration Challenges;
- Fidelity to the Wraparound Process;
- Client Satisfaction;
- Strengths of the NWSP; and
- Opportunities for Improvement.

6.1 Immigration Challenges

At the beginning of the interview, participants were asked to describe the most challenging barriers to immigration and settlement that they have encountered throughout their work. The most notable challenges derived from these findings include: (1) limited resources in the broader community; (2) family separation; and (3) cultural differences.

Limited Resources in the Broader Community

All six participants noted limited resources in the broader community as a barrier to settlement and integration. According to Participant G3I3, “I don't think that Canada does enough for refugees and newcomers. Doctors and other professionals come to Canada thinking that they will be able to practice their profession and this is not guaranteed, which can make people very frustrated. Childcare is also a very big aspect that contributes to limitations. Sometimes, the community connection is there, but language barriers prevent newcomers from successfully settling into Canada. In addition, subsidized family housing has become a nightmare. B.C. Housing can take up to a year or beyond to provide housing for newcomers.” Participant G3I4 noted, “I think my clients are really pleased, but they wish we could have more resources, especially in regard to housing, due to the housing crisis here in Victoria. Clients with large households, like four to seven children, struggle to find a suitable home. So, some clients wish we could have more resources than we do, or a greater ability to impact decisions at a community level.” Participant G3I5 echoed these remarks through stating, “Clients understand that sometimes our hands are tied, but we try our best. For example, for daycare, one of the staff is struggling to help a family, because they have five children, and three of them need daycare. But, all the daycare services on the island are full and there is nothing we can do.”

Family Separation

Of the six interview participants, four (66.7%) mentioned family separation as another barrier to settlement and integration. Participant G3I2 stated, “I think immigrating from one location to another and losing the family and community connections is very difficult for newcomers. I think that social isolation is challenging. For example, back home, you have parents who can take care of your child, but who are you going to ask for help here? If you get sick, who's going to take care of you, or who's going to take care of your aging parents back home? I think the integration process doesn't give you an answer to these concerns, so that must be a struggle. It's almost like you must make a choice between striving for a better life and leaving your loved ones behind… separation is never easy to manage.” Participant G3I3 explained, “Sometimes our clients would like
to reunite with their family members. However, we don't have a lot of power here. That is entirely controlled by Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada. If the process is unsuccessful, we see our clients slowing down, getting depressed, isolated, and sad because they are detached from their families and they want to reunite, but there is no way. As case managers, all we can do is lift them up and encourage them...our hands are tied otherwise.” Similarly, Participant G315 noted, “Clients become frustrated and homesick. They can also become depressed and feel hopeless. So, our staff need to be good listeners, to listen to their needs.”

**CULTURAL DIFFERENCES**

Of the six interview participants, two (33.3%) highlighted cultural differences, wherein the various beliefs, behaviours, languages, practices, and expressions considered unique to a subgroup differ from the dominant group within society, as a common barrier to settlement and integration. According to Participant G311, “I’d say one of the most difficult challenges to integration is cultural differences. Because I understand their culture and I also understand Canadian culture, I can help newcomers adapt to everything, the language, the food, even the communication style. Sometimes there can be major misunderstandings because of varying communication styles among clients and the service provider. I know that for most of my clients, integration is going well, except for having to navigate cultural differences. I can see that the Canadian culture is challenging for them.” Participant G313 explained, “We have a lot of domestic violence issues, which mainly arise due to cultural differences between the old and new environment of newcomers, in addition to financial constraints. Acquiring a suitable job is also a challenge...those who may be able to acquire employment may struggle with job retention because of cultural differences.” Participant G316 stated, “Clients occasionally feel like they need their case managers to survive. Everyone has their own background, so maybe in another culture, they can get more help or are more attached to other people. Canada is all about independence. Sometimes things that clients need to start doing on their own become challenging, and clients become attached to their case manager.”

**6.2 Fidelity to the Wraparound Approach**

In addition to describing common barriers to settlement and integration, participants were questioned about their knowledge regarding the four phases and ten principles of the wraparound approach. These findings revealed that the NWSP is client-centred, outcome-based, and knowledgeable of the appropriate components regarding the wraparound process.

**CLIENT-CENTRED SERVICES**

One of the most emphasized principles of the wraparound approach among all six interview participants was delivering client-centred services. Wraparound theory refers to client-centred services as individualized. According to Bruns and colleagues (2008), this principle emphasizes that the wraparound plan is uniquely tailored to the client’s needs, thus instigating their voice and choice in the services that are delivered (p. 7). Wraparound teams are challenged to create strategies for providing help and support that can be delivered beyond the boundaries of the traditional service environment. Individualization results as team members collaboratively design a plan that capitalizes on their collective strengths, creativity, and knowledge of possible strategies and available resources (Bruns *et al.*, 2008, pp. 7-8).

In accordance, interview participants within this Group often mentioned placing the client at the centre as one of the most important aspects of the NWSP. For example, Participant G311 explained, “As the name itself indicates, wraparound is about placing the family at the centre and assisting them with everything they need from A to Z, like housing issues, health issues, transportation, or translation. Sometimes I assist with school and do referrals for families for anything they need help with in order to ensure that they are successfully integrated into society. We deal with misunderstandings by coming together and allowing everyone to explain their point of view, so we can reach an agreement without any hard feelings. Regardless of any agreements or disagreements between case managers and clients or case managers and other staff, everyone always remembers that the client is the number one priority.”
Similarly, Participant G3I2 noted, “We sit down with the client to create their wraparound plan. Then we decide how the client will live their life in Canada. Ultimately, the client is the one deciding how they are going to navigate themselves in Canadian society. We see the client in a host of directions in order to ensure that the client's voice is heard during the intake process.” Participant G3I3 expressed, “I believe that the client is the Alpha and Omega of the way forward. I am just there to support and provide information and guidance. I don't impose things. I put different options on the table and my clients pick what they need and I will support them. A client-centred approach is our goal.” Participant G3I4 noted, “We don't judge. We just try to show them choices they can implement, but the decision clients make is ultimately dependent on them and their unique needs. After the intake process, we know what every client has been through and what is the most urgent need that they must work on. Consequently, we can set up a plan for each client, designed on their unique needs. Then we know how to approach the situation and approximately how long it will take to transition them. The Settlement Team creates a skeleton of the plan, the case manager reviews the plan with the client, then the client chooses what to focus on. This plan is flexible and it can change with time.”

**Outcome-Based Services**

The principle of delivering outcome-based services through the wraparound approach was also noted among each of the interview participants. According to Bruns and colleagues (2008), the outcome-based principle is about connecting the goals and strategies of the wraparound plan to observable or measurable indicators of success, monitoring progress in terms of these indicators, and revising the plan accordingly (p. 9). The success of implementing this measure was noted when participants mentioned how their former clients tend to return to share their accomplishments. Participant G3I1 explained, “Former clients will often share their positive experiences. Sometimes they will come and share a success story. For example, sometimes they will interact with others in the supermarket, and interacting with others is a big win for my clients, because Canada is not like our culture. It’s not a collective culture where people constantly get together, socialize with their neighbours, and run into people they know in the grocery store. Consequently, once my clients make small conversation with someone, it makes them very proud. Perhaps, this Program gives them the push to be confident and have faith that their English is quite good, so when they graduate from the Program, they can engage in society successfully and speak up for themselves.”

Participant G3I2 explained, “Clients send e-mails about how successful their life has been, or they come back to VIRCS and report their stories to me. For example, when they successfully acquire their citizenship after we have helped them sort out their immigration documents, they will come back to let us know that the process has been successful.” Participant G3I4 stated, “We know our clients have been successful when they stop visiting us as often. When we call them, they will tell us that they are working, doing well, keeping busy. This is how we know that our client is becoming independent and no longer needs our help. They might come after a while if a new challenge arises, and they are welcome, and we re-intake them. However, most clients graduate and settle; they become successful.” Participant G3I6 explained, “Obviously, clients will have new challenges all the time. However, the Program is there to help them address one challenge at a time until they feel comfortable enough to address their own challenges without any assistance from case managers.” Finally, Participant G3I5 concluded the outcome-based approach of the NWSP as she stated, “Good feedback is a former client bringing another client to VIRCS. This means that clients have shared the successes they have achieved through VIRCS with others in the community.”

**Adherence to Wraparound Theory**

When participants were asked about their knowledge regarding the four phases and ten principles of the wraparound approach, 66.7% (n=4) of participants had some awareness of these theoretical foundations; however, all six of the participants admitted that the NWSP does not strictly adhere to these formal processes due to its adaptive and flexible nature. For example, Participant G3I1 explained, “I would say yes, we follow these phases in some way, but I have learned about the Program in more practical ways, like through working directly with clients and seeking direction from senior staff when I was unsure of something. In the beginning, I did not really understand the meaning behind wraparound, but now I do. For example, I understand that the
client is at the centre and I know the appropriate resources to suggest when clients face various challenges to settlement.”

Participant G3I3 stated, “Wraparound is very flexible. Nothing is absolute. The Program is very strength-based and non-judgmental.” Further, Participant G3I4 stated, “We do have this framework, but I don't know if we strictly follow it. I think our main goal is to help. We respect everyone's different ethnic background, religion, and culture. We look at the client as a person who is in need, regardless of any differences, and we try our best to help them meet their needs.” Participant G3I5 also noted, “Since we started this Program in 2012, these phases and principles have been present throughout the years, as we have to touch on them when we apply for funding every year. However, all I care about is ensuring that clients are happy and settled in Canada. If we can achieve this, then I would say that we have done our job.”

### 6.3 Client Satisfaction

In addition to questions regarding immigration barriers faced by clients and wraparound fidelity measures, Group 3 interview participants were also asked to describe their perceptions regarding client satisfaction. These findings are similar to the survey findings and results derived from the interviews with Groups 1 and 2, as all six of the participants stated that clients generally seem very satisfied with the NWSP. For example, Participant G3I1 explained, “I know my clients are quite satisfied because they are independent and powerful, and they can do things for themselves. They like the Program so much and they like the positive energy they receive from us when they come to meetings.” Participant G3I3 stated, “Many of our clients leave happy. I would say every client eventually brings us family and friends, so each case manager can build their own community through their clients due to good rapport with their clients. I have clients I stay in touch with who have now moved all around the world. They will call me to check in… that's why I'm here. I find it very emotionally rewarding when I help somebody and I see the impact. This Program has helped clients bring their family to Canada, settle, get a job, and send their kids to school.”

Participant G3I4 stated, “In general, clients are really pleased because we are always there trying to help, create a wraparound plan, review their barriers and challenges, effectively address them, and help them become a part of Canadian community.” Participant G3I5 noted, “Emotionally, clients don't want to leave the Program, but it's like parents and their children. Eventually, children grow up. Most of the clients at VIRCS view this organization as their second home, but they know no matter how good their parents are to them, they will have to say goodbye one day to become independent.” Finally, Participant G3I6 has summarized the high levels of client satisfaction derived from these findings through explaining, “There are always going to be people who may expect more than we can give, we are only human. However, many clients will come back and thank us for our help, and they tell us about their new and improved lives.”

### 6.4 Strengths of the NWSP

The interview findings have resulted in a number of strengths regarding the NWSP. In addition to adhering to some of the most instrumental principles of the wraparound approach, common strengths noted include: (1) diverse and flexible services; (2) high level of cultural competence; (3) passionate service providers; and (4) strong working alliance. Evidently, a number of these subthemes echo the findings derived from Groups 1 and 2 interviews.

**DIVERSE AND FLEXIBLE SERVICES**

Of the six interview participants, five (83.3%) mentioned having diverse and flexible services as a strength of the NWSP. For example, Participant G3I1 described, “I conduct a lot of workshops and settlement services, such as information, orientation, and connecting newcomers to community resources.” Participant G3I3 explained, “The wraparound approach entails different stakeholders and various services. We offer community connections, such as jobs, housing, and social integration. We also have outreach services, where we accompany our clients to B.C. Housing, the police, the hospital, and the courts. In addition, we conduct home
visits, long-term case management, group sessions (i.e. workshops), and one-on-one services. We also have crisis intervention services, men's group, women's group, senior's group, youth groups, employment skills for youth, teen's painting classes, and buddy programs. Furthermore, we offer childcare services, computer classes, and employment skills training. Sometimes, we try to help our clients get their foreign education documents recognized or go to university in Canada, and we encourage those who want to proceed in their field of expertise to challenge the national exams, or we send them to Vancouver for an international evaluation of their degrees.” Participant G3I4 explained, “I try to help my clients with everything I can to settle into Canada, including completing government forms, finding housing, attending doctor's appointments, and providing translation services.”

The flexibility of the service was highlighted through case managers’ willingness to extend the duration of their clients’ stay within the Program in order to ensure that they received all of the services necessary to properly integrate and settle into Canada. For example, Participant G3I2 explained, “Usually, my goal is to graduate clients within three to four months…Although they generally finish within this timeframe, some of my clients stay more than a year, depending on what type of situation they are in. If you have highly vulnerable clients who face multiple barriers to integration and settlement, we need to invest extra time into helping them out. If a client only needs a lawyer or a place to live, then we need to hurry up to ensure that they have their needs met.” Participant G3I3 also highlighted the necessity of flexible services due to multiple barriers, “I have clients who have been here four to five years, clients who have multiple barriers…How often we meet with a specific client depends on their needs. Some are high needs and others are low needs. If they are completely new to the country or are refugees, they may want to learn the language, find a job, and acquire some community connections. We can sit down with these clients and help them meet such goals, and then they move on. However, clients who have multiple issues and barriers, such as domestic violence, mental health, trauma, and court issues, are clients who may visit every day or visit weekly and remain in the Program for a longer period of time.”

Similarly, Participant G3I5 stated, “Most clients graduate, but some have multiple barriers, such as disability and mental health issues, which can increase the length of time that clients stay in the Program. For example, single moms who endure domestic violence may need help with the divorce process, then with looking after their kids. Logically, clients should graduate within a year, but due to these kinds of issues, they may not be able to. We call clients who have stayed in the Program for over a year ‘returning clients.’ I’d say roughly 20% of our current clients fit this category.” Participant G3I4 noted the flexibility case managers offer their clients by stating, “Some clients will call us even on the weekend, because they know that we will be there when they need something.” This aspect was also mentioned among other participants, who explained that their clients will text and call them on a regular basis, despite the time of day.

**High Levels of Cultural Competence**

Cultural competence was another strength noted among 83.3% (n=5) of Group 3 interview participants. The most common factor pertaining to cultural competence from this portion of the interviews included the NWSP’s effort to match clients with case workers of similar backgrounds. For example, Participant G3I1 explained, “I am from Saudi Arabia and most of my clients are from Syria, so I totally understand their background and culture and they understand mine…because we share the same culture, they don’t have to explain things to me as much as they would have to explain them to someone with a different culture.” Participant G3I3 echoed these statements through explaining, “Over the years, the influx of Syrian refugees caused us to hire more Arabic speaking case managers. So, now we have one full-time case manager for Arabic speakers and a part-time Arabic case manager for youth.”

Participant G3I3 further highlighted VIRCS’ cultural competence through describing the organization as a multicultural place. According to the participant, “When you enter a Canadian setting, you have to abide by their system. At VIRCS, you can be yourself. No one cares about your accent, beliefs, traditions…Canadian settings can lead to difficulties due to cultural differences, such as time management approaches or different communication styles.” Participant G3I6 summarized the cultural competence of case workers as she stated, “Case managers need to be open to their clients, and one of the things they need to know is the appropriate
way to approach newcomers. Everyone varies, that's why we've hired case managers who speak Arabic, because we have a lot of Arabic clients...everyone has their own culture, their own beliefs, and their own ways of being...case managers need to be sensitive to this.”

**Passionate Service Providers**

Three (50%) of the six interview participants also cited having passionate service providers to deliver the wraparound approach as a strength of the NWSP. Participant G3I1 explained, “I have feelings and I get attached to my clients, which may cause my clients to feel dependent on the Program because they are comfortable with me, since I show them that I clearly care about their needs and I am trying my best to help them. Even though I cannot solve all of their problems, when they come to me, they know that at least there is someone who understands, who can listen, and relate to their point of view, so they leave happy. I think that the way I communicate and work with my clients can make them feel dependent on the Program.” Participant G3I2 explained, “I think that every professional in this field must think about the client. Sometimes I wonder if my client is alright. For instance, in domestic and interpersonal violence situations, I worry about my client. This worry stresses me out more than anything else. Their safety is my concern. I can give safety protocols regarding violence, but how they react in the situation varies. I worry when the weekend comes. I know that my clients can get help. If they need to call the police department or a shelter, I make sure they know how to do so and provide them with all the relevant information before they go home. However, I still worry.”

Participant G3I3 admitted, “Sometimes, too much zeal and passion for your client can get you into trouble. In the past, I had to hide my client from CBSA, who wanted to deport her and her children. They arrested her with her two children crying, so I had to go and smuggle her out of the house. This did not impress my Executive Director, but as a social justice activist, I couldn't stand by and watch the two kids be separated from their mother, regardless of the circumstance. At the end of the day, we are global citizens, and we cannot be confined by international boundaries. This is my worldview, and because of this, I will do everything to ensure that my client is walking on the safe side, at any cost. I'd rather lose my job. If something is against my values, I can't take it. Maybe this is because I was once a refugee, so I know what it's like to deal with CBSA. So, I get personal, especially when parents are detained and separated from their children simply because of immigration documents.”

**Strong Working Alliance**

Having passionate service providers is related to working alliance, which is the final strength that emerged through this portion of the interviews. Specifically, 83.3% (n=5) of participants cited strong working alliance as an asset of the NWSP. In addition to the flexibility, availability, and cultural competence of case managers, working alliance was exemplified through strong communication among the Settlement Team, the implementation of appropriate conflict resolution techniques, and an organized process of service delivery. For example, Participant G3I2 explained, “Regular check-ins with our clients obtains their trust. If they feel like they need a place to call home – a place they can access in the case of an emergency – or they just simply need their voice to be heard and be taken care of, they know that they can come to us because our client-centred service delivery approach is very effective in ensuring we have a good relationship with our clients.” Participant G3I3 emphasized that in most situations clients and their case managers tend to work quite well together, and if any misunderstandings arise, there are processes in place to ensure that clients’ concerns are heard. For example, the participant noted, “If a client feels that they have been treated unfairly, they report to the Director or the Executive Director, who may initiate an investigation. If it is determined that there has been a violation of ethical conduct, case managers may receive a warning or be placed under review.”

Participants G3I1, G3I2, and G3I4 commented on the importance of having appropriate systems of operation in place among the Settlement Team in order to ensure high levels of working alliance. For example, Participant G3I1 explained, “I think it is important to have healthy communication between the case workers, other staff, and the clients. Good cooperation and communication between the case workers and the staff will affect how we work with the client as a team.” Similarly, Participant G3I2 stated, “I think it is important to
have an intake coordinator\textsuperscript{10} so that the administrative duties, funding, and other extra things that need to be overseen can be managed by a competent staff member, while case managers focus on ensuring that clients’ needs are met.” Participant G3I4 commented on the importance of having a supportive superior as she explained, “Our previous Director was really supportive. He tried to assure the clients that we will do our best to help whenever they had any concerns, and he was always there for his staff, because he understood that our job can be really stressful.” The participant did not comment on the current director because she returned from a leave of absence and did not work with him long enough to be familiar with his work-ethic.

### 6.5 Opportunities for Improvement

The final theme that emerged from these interview findings is premised on opportunities for improvement, which primarily focus on the structure of the NWSP and comprise of: (1) enhanced activities to help release stress among staff; (2) improved retention techniques; (3) more structured training and orientation; and (4) enhanced funds and resources.

**Activities to Help Release Stress**

All six of the participants expressed that their job was stressful, which sometimes caused them to take leaves of absence from work in order to manage their stress levels. For example, Participant G3I1 stated, “Of course, I am overwhelmed. There are some cases that are beyond my control and I simply cannot help my clients solve their problems. In such instances, I feel completely helpless and become so overwhelmed.” Participant G3I4 explained, “I actually have to take a long leave because of the stress. We love the job here, but it comes with a lot of stress, especially emotional stress. It can be overwhelming at times. For example, if clients run into me in the community, they will stop me and start asking me questions. They will also call me on the weekend. It’s not like the work you leave behind at a normal office job; you take this work with you everywhere.” Participant G3I5 stated, “When there was a high influx of Syrian refugees to Canada, we suddenly had 100 new clients within a month, and we were short-staffed. I think in emergency situations like this, case managers are definitely faced with a lot of stress.” Participant G3I6 explained, “The Settlement Team is overwhelmed because sometimes they need more employment. We rely on volunteers a lot due to a lack of monetary resources. Volunteers are really good, but they change all the time.”

While participants noted that VIRCS offers extensive training sessions for staff on dispute resolution and debriefing, they cited the need for more team building activities, training focused on stress management, and greater support for self-care. Participant G3I1 noted, “My form of debrief is taking a walk outside for about an hour after work to clear my mind. Another thing that could help staff is potentially hosting events once or twice a month outside of the office, like having a barbeque or going on a trip together. This could bring staff closer together outside the working environment.” Participant G3I4 explained that engaging in stress-management trainings has been quite helpful in the past, and it would be beneficial if VIRCS could offer these types of resources more often. Finally, Participants G3I2 and G3I3 emphasized the importance of engaging in self-care. Participant G3I2 explained, “VIRCS has insurance policies that cover counselling services. However, I'd rather go to the gym, work out, and engage in self-care, because I can do this on my own time, without having to make an appointment.” Participant G3I3 stated, “I am a very active man. I go to the gym seven days a week, I run marathons. I am also very involved in the community by being a part of various boards and engaging in humanitarian missions... The most important thing is to know your boundaries, remain ethical, and engage in self-care. Leave work at work, don’t entertain it at home.”

**Structured Training and Orientation**

In order to determine program effectiveness, participants in Group 3 were asked about the level of training they have received to administer the NWSP. The findings from this portion of the interview are mixed. Of the

\textsuperscript{10} The intake coordinator is the first contact person for newcomers. The intake coordinator matches the client with the right case manager, who can meet the interests and needs of the client. This is determined through an Intake Needs Assessment (A. Okot-Ochen, personal communication, March 25, 2019).
six participants, four (66.7%) explained that there are formal training sessions available throughout B.C. that teach program administrators about the wraparound approach and effective service delivery. However, there did not appear to be any formal trainings administered at VIRCS. Moreover, the training sessions available throughout the province also seemed to cease when funding for the NWSP shifted from the provincial government to the federal government in 2014, albeit there remain several training sessions among the settlement sector that the Settlement Team can attend. According to Participant G3I3, these trainings are budgeted for, including their transportation and stay. Participant G3I2 explained, “I went to a training in Vancouver, and I also went to a training on Vancouver Island. I attended these sessions before 2014, when the Program was funded by the provincial government. However, when funding shifted to the federal government in 2014, these trainings were no longer available to us. The training in Vancouver explained the theory behind the NWSP and how it is supposed to work with respect to the most vulnerable immigrants in the province, whereas the training on Vancouver Island was more about how to implement the NWSP. These training sessions lasted approximately one week in total.”

Participant G3I3 stated, “At the inception of the Program, I went to Vancouver to learn about the NWSP. This was the first time the wraparound approach was adopted by the B.C. provincial government. In addition, we are very privileged as a settlement sector, as we have multiple options for training. The Affiliation of Multicultural Societies and Service Agencies, for example, conducts almost weekly and monthly online trainings. The Canadian Council for Refugees also offers training online. I would say B.C. has tried to establish a platform for all wraparound services in the province. We meet in Vancouver for training.” Participant G3I4 also mentioned online trainings. However, she stated that these classes are voluntary and it can become difficult to engage in the training, given the heavy workload and stressful nature of the job. She stated, “When I have multiple clients with multiple barriers, online training is the last thing on my mind. In addition, VIRCS may want us to engage in continuous learning, but we have to pay for most of the online trainings, and the staff can't afford it. It would be better if VIRCS covered the training and made it mandatory.” Given these findings, a potential opportunity for improvement may be to establish a formal orientation to the NWSP among new team members in order to ensure coherence among the Settlement Team and provide a strong foundation for program administration.

**Improved Retention Techniques**

Two (33.3%) of the interview participants revealed that many of the employees at VIRCS have taken leaves of absence to manage their stress, resulting in high staff turnover rates and limited human resources. Participant G3I3 explained, “There have been many changes in management. Since inception, we’ve had approximately three to four directors…they leave because the Program is underfunded, so they don’t get paid proportionally to the work that they do. Unless you have passion to help you carry through, the work can be very overwhelming. We have lost many talented staff due to a lack of pay, lack of benefits, and a lot of work. Most of those who remain, especially young professionals, work two jobs to sustain themselves and their families. However, the team is very qualified…the entire team has a master's degree. So, we are a very skilled team, but we are here because we love what we do. Otherwise, we could have gone to work somewhere else. I struggle every day; I debate if I should stay or pursue better opportunities. However, I always end up staying because I am passionate about my work.”

Participant G3I1 stated, “Considering the number of clients we have and the heavy cases we are dealing with, I believe the emotional drain is taxing. I am not necessarily saying we are underpaid, but it doesn’t help that we do not have job security. Our jobs depend on the funding we receive from the federal government during each fiscal year. Each year, we have to write a proposal for funding and report on clients’ experiences in order to justify the continuation of the Program. Always being in the unknown is not an easy process. I need to make sure that I will have a job that can support my family. Having certainty around my job would help me serve my clients better because I won’t have to worry about potential unemployment each year. If there was guaranteed, secure funding, I believe case managers would function better.” These findings reveal a potential opportunity for VIRCS to improve its retention techniques through hiring more employees and increasing wages, albeit this would require additional funding and resources.
ENHANCED FUNDS AND RESOURCES

The final opportunity for improvement noted was enhanced funds and resources. Each of the interview participants explained that they strive to make the most of available resources. Nevertheless, the need for more funding to implement a greater variety of workshops, hire more case managers, increase the wages of case managers, and offer formalized training were often suggested as opportunities for improvement.

Participant G3I1 mentioned the need for more case managers, as she explained, “I think the Program could be better and more effective if there were more case managers hired, because sometimes clients’ cases are quite heavy. Sometimes not only one family member, but all family members face a multitude of barriers. If there is a family with seven members and they each face a multitude of barriers, the case manager has to address each of these issues for one family alone, in addition to all of the other clients that they have. This can be quite overwhelming, so if there were more staff, then they could take on some of these cases and allow case workers to focus on a select number of families, rather than trying to concurrently manage so many clients that it is impossible to effectively deliver services to each person.”

Participant G3I1 also commented on the need for more workshops, “I think something that could make the Program more effective is to offer more workshops or trainings intended to introduce newcomers to the Canadian culture. I think this is the only gap in the Program, because we cover everything from A to Z, except this part.” Similarly, Participant G3I2 noted, “I think we have enough community resources, but if we could have more, it would be helpful. It would be helpful if we could get more funding to deliver more workshops. More is better, because then you can hire more people who speak different languages, or more people to conduct different types of workshops. I also think that the spacing in our office needs improvement. If we could have extra space to conduct workshops, it would be better. There are so many programs and services at VIRCS, that we sometimes compete for room reservations. So, if we could have extra space, that would ease the stress of the staff who need to reserve rooms for workshops.”

Participant G3I3 explained the funding structure of the NWSP in more detail, “We need increased funding. There are conditions set by the federal government that limit us in what we can do with the funding we receive. Sometimes we don't always have sufficient resources to adequately help our clients. In the past, we had some resources to offer first aid certifications, food safe, serving it right, and many more training opportunities. These are no longer available. In addition, the transportation budget is insufficient to accompany clients on outreach services. We also don't have emergency funds. Sometimes clients may come to us for help with their kids, but the Ministry of Children and Family Development is closed, and we don't have funds to put them up in a hotel. Sometimes people will also come to us with mental health issues and we have no appropriate resources to help them. We need counselling services paid for clients, instead of referring clients to certified counsellors and expecting them to pay for themselves. We need increased wages for case managers. There is high inflation and wages are static, so it is tough to make a living doing this job, especially if you have a family, that's why most of us work two jobs. If we had more resources, we would be able to offer more support, empower our clients, and propel them to greater levels.”

Participant G3I5 also noted the need for diversified funds, “We lack a lot of resources, especially housing and mental health support. The government doesn't have enough money to pay for these resources, or family doctors. This is especially tough. We want to do a better job, but we don't have enough resources in the community to help our clients. Getting a family doctor can take years. Also, people with lower English levels don't have a place to learn English, because ESL classes everywhere are full. We also don't have enough daycare… I think if the government could provide more funding for mental health, housing, daycare, and ESL classes, things would be better for newcomers.” Participant G3I4 summarized the comments regarding the need for enhanced funds and resources through stating, “Overall, the NWSP is a really good program. Lots of families benefit from this Program, but I think it needs more support.”
Summary: Group 3 Interview Findings

Six key-informant interviews were conducted with members of VIRCS’ Settlement Team.

Five key themes emerged from the interview findings: (1) Immigration Challenges; (2) Fidelity to the Wraparound Process; (3) Client Satisfaction; (4) Strengths of the NWSP; and (5) Opportunities for Improvement.

The most notable challenges that derived from these findings include: (1) Cultural Differences; (2) Family Separation; and (3) Limited Resources in the Broader Community.

According to the interview findings, cultural differences could lead to depression among clients and prevent job retention. Family separation, coupled with Canada’s individualistic nature, could raise barriers to settlement and integration by making newcomers feel isolated. Limited resources in the broader community, including housing and daycare, could also pose difficulties to settlement and integration.

Wraparound fidelity questions revealed that the NWSP is client-centred, outcome-based, and knowledgeable of the appropriate components regarding the wraparound process.

Interview participants often mentioned placing the client at the centre as one of the most important aspects of the NWSP. In addition, participants noted that clients would often return to share the successes and accomplishments the NWSP has helped them achieve.

Most participants had some awareness of wraparound theory; however, many admitted that the NWSP does not strictly adhere to these formal processes due to its adaptive and flexible nature.

Client satisfaction results were similar to findings derived from the surveys and interviews with Groups 1 and 2, as all six of the participants noted that their clients seemed very satisfied with the Program.

In addition to adhering to some of the most instrumental principles of the wraparound approach, common strengths that were cited with respect to the NWSP include: (1) diverse and flexible services; (2) high level of cultural competence; (3) passionate service providers; and (4) strong working alliance. Evidently, a number of these subthemes echo the findings presented in the Groups 1 and 2 Interview Findings portion of this report.

Opportunities for improvement from a service provider perspective included: (1) enhanced activities to help release stress among staff; (2) improved retention techniques; (3) more structured training and orientation; and (4) enhanced funds and resources.
7.0 Discussion and Analysis

7.1 Introduction

This study has implications for both the service delivery and operations of the NWSP. While the literature review primarily focused on wraparound approaches implemented in child welfare and youth justice, many of the results from this study align with findings noted in previous research regarding wraparound effectiveness. However, some findings were unique to the field of immigration and settlement, thereby warranting further discussion. The findings of this research will be discussed under the same headings as the literature review to illustrate the extent to which results align with previous research and provide answers for the research questions raised in Chapter 1.

The main purpose of this study was to answer: To what extent, if any, does VIRCS’ NWSP effectively help vulnerable newcomers navigate multiple barriers to social integration and immigration settlement?

Secondary research questions included:
- What is the current state of the NWSP?
- What aspects of the Program are working well?
- What aspects of the Program can be improved?

The five themes discussed in the literature review were: (1) goal attainment; (2) client resilience; (3) wraparound fidelity; (4) working alliance; and (5) overall client satisfaction with the NWSP.

7.2 Goal Attainment

Goal attainment has been noted as one of the most common predictors of wraparound effectiveness (Bruns et al., 2014, p. 309; Debicki et al., 2012, p. 2). Specifically, the literature review revealed that having individualized goal setting and monitoring processes in place, a high level of fidelity to the four phases and ten principles of the wraparound approach, and highly trained case managers who can adequately assess and identify clients’ needs are essential in ensuring successful goal attainment among clients (Andrade, 2003, p. 135; Bickman et al., 2003, p. 152; Bruns et al., 2014, p. 309; Debicki et al., 2012, p. 20; Walker & Schutte, 2004, p. 184). Interestingly, the findings of this study do not necessarily align with the literature review. With respect to having individualized goal setting and monitoring processes in place, the survey findings revealed that only 50% (n=20) of participants recorded their progress during wraparound meetings, while 50% (n=20) of participants did not record their progress often or held a neutral opinion. Furthermore, zero clients who never met with their case manager on a monthly basis recorded their progress. Nevertheless, this may potentially be due to the fact that some enrolled clients of the NWSP have been in the Program for several years and only visit VIRCS on occasion. In addition, none of the clients who participated in interviews recorded their progress during wraparound meetings, while interviews with Group 3 revealed that case managers do not have formalized trainings in place to help them administer the NWSP.

However, these deviations from the literature did not appear to impact participants’ successful goal attainment. The GAS (Goal Attainment Scaling) survey measures revealed that 68% (n=27) of participants have learned the Canadian banking system; 68% (n=27) were able to go to school or acquire recognition for their foreign education documents; 60% (n=24) found a suitable job; 60% (n=24) addressed issues with their immigration documents; 57.5% (n=23) were able to acquire appropriate medical documents; and 55% (n=22) found suitable housing. In addition, 82.5% (n=33) of participants stated that their circumstances have improved and 80% (n=32) of participants were satisfied with the progress they have made since starting the NWSP, while only 27.5% (n=11) of participants believed that the NWSP may end before their needs have been met. While these scores could be higher, it is important to note that many of these goals are difficult to accomplish. For example, case managers stated that often times their hands are tied in terms of helping clients find housing, daycare, and employment due to limited resources in the broader community. Participant G3I5 explained, “We lack a lot of resources, especially housing and mental health support. The government doesn’t have enough
money to pay for these resources, or family doctors. This is especially tough. We want to do a better job, but we don't have enough resources in the community to help our clients. Getting a family doctor can take years. Also, people with lower English levels don't have a place to learn English, because ESL classes everywhere are full. We also don't have enough daycare.”

Note that there is a housing crisis in Greater Victoria, daycare services are at capacity, and ESL (English as a Second Language) classes are limited, among other gaps in the immigration settlement sector. In addition, the purpose of the NWSP is to serve the most vulnerable newcomers in the province, who often face a multitude of complex challenges that may require significant time and resources to address. For example, the average rate of immigration barriers among survey participants was three, while some noted that traumatic experiences from their country of origin were preventing them from properly settling into Canada. With that said, over half of the survey participants reporting that VIRCS has helped them accomplish their goals is arguably a sign of effective goal attainment. In light of this point, recall that interviews with clients revealed that the NWSP has helped each participant find a job, learn English, acquire their Canadian citizenship, find housing, or address issues with their immigration documents, among helping them manage other barriers they faced to settlement and integration. Similarly, interviews with Group 3 have identified that the strengths of the NWSP included goal orientation and outcome-based service delivery. For example, 100% (n=6) of participants noted that their clients will often return to share success stories with case managers and express gratitude for receiving help to achieve their goals.

Perhaps these positive results regarding goal attainment are associated with having culturally competent and passionate case managers. Interview participants from Groups 1 and 2 appeared grateful for their case manager’s ability to connect with them on a human level and offer unconditional help, without any judgement. Many interview participants from these groups also noted that they were grateful for the opportunity to engage with someone who understood their background and their situation. In addition, Group 3 interview participants explained that they become attached to their clients and often worry about their wellbeing. One participant admitted that he would be willing to sacrifice his career in order to help a client who was wronged by the immigration system. Respectively, Groups 1 and 2 interview participants often noted that they were overwhelmed with the extent of help that they have received from VIRCS. As noted in the findings, many participants admitted that they would have been unable to meet their needs without VIRCS.

The findings of this study may also deviate from the goal attainment literature because newcomers may have different needs than children and youth in regard to successful goal attainment. For example, interview findings with Group 3 revealed that one of the most notable barriers newcomers face to settlement and integration is cultural differences, whereas wraparound in the broader literature is often implemented to help youth with serious emotional disturbance. Phinney, Ong, and Madden (2000) state that two fundamental values that have been shown to differentiate European American culture from most non-Western cultures are individualism and collectivism (p. 529). Collectivism can be defined by an emphasis on group interdependence, harmony in interpersonal relations, and conformity to group norms, whereas individualism favours freedom of action for individuals over collective or state control (Phinney et al., 2000, p. 529). Many of the newcomers who receive services through the NWSP originate from collective cultures, wherein human connection, strong emphasis on family interdependence, and reliance on an extended family system are valued above individual autonomy. This fact is exemplified through the demographic findings of this study, wherein 65% (n=26) of survey respondents were Asian, 25% (n=10) were Black/African, and 8% (n=3) were Middle Eastern. Furthermore, 60% (n=3) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants were Black/African and 40% (n=2) were Asian, while countries of origin were primarily located in collectivist geographical locations, such as Asia and Africa.

With that said, it may be possible that case managers delivered the NWSP to their clients in a way that would be well-received in their culture. This would be in accordance with research findings from the Peel Region of Ontario, wherein newcomers have been increasingly accessing support through informal resources such as cultural groups, faith groups, and social networks. Although these informal sources of support are less structured and have limited financial capacity, they “tend to accommodate the newcomers’ preferences for engaged support structures, offering face-to-face, one-on-one supports in comfortable, accessible settings in
their own language in ways that are responsive to their cultural expectations” (Community Development Council of Durham [CDC], 2012, p. 12). While demographic data was not collected among Group 3 interview participants, many originated from predominantly collectivist cultures as well. The majority of participants also noted that the Program has allowed them to practice their religion, culture, and values without feeling judged. For example, 100% (n=3) of Middle Eastern participants, 96.6% (n=22) of Asian participants, and 87.5% (n=7) of Black/African participants stated that the Program has allowed them to practice their background unconditionally.

Furthermore, recall that 100% (n=6) of Group 3 interview participants emphasized the importance of placing the client at the centre and wrapping them with the necessary services to ensure their success. As such, it may be possible that having casual and practical relationships with their clients that nurture human connection and foster trust to an extent where clients feel comfortable calling their case managers at any given time of day, is a more important conduit of goal achievement among vulnerable newcomers than formal processes, such as periodically recording and monitoring progress. This postulation would align with the findings of Bickman and colleagues (2003), who state that the needs of clients must be accurately determined by case managers in order to allow for effective services that will adequately help wraparound clients address the complex barriers they face in society (p. 152). In fact, Bickman and colleagues (2003) argue that having case managers who can intrinsically determine the needs of clients is a more important predictor of success than receiving formal services, given that these services may not necessarily be what clients need (p. 152).

### 7.3 Client Resilience

Client resilience, as defined in the literature review, has also been noted as an important indicator of a wraparound program’s success. Pervious wraparound evaluations have shown that effective needs identification, the presence of natural and formal supports, caring relationships, and having a sense of belonging are important factors for fostering resilience among vulnerable clients (Debicki et al., 2012, p. 12; MacDonnell et al., 2012, p. 5; Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 47). Depending on the extent these factors are implemented into the wraparound process, an increase in resilience during the administration of wraparound approaches should be a successful indicator of wraparound effectiveness (Debicki et al., 2012, p. 12; Payne-Moss, 2017, pp. 73-83).

The findings of this study are aligned with previous findings in the literature. According to Payne-Moss (2017), effective wraparound plans and collaborative wraparound teams are important determinants of increased levels of resilience (pp. 78-83). As noted in the results, 97.5% (n=34) of respondents who discussed their needs believed that their wraparound team was respectful of their culture, ethnicity, religion and values and claimed to be happy with their wraparound team, while only 35% (n=12) stated that they feel misunderstood by their wraparound team. Furthermore, of the 35 participants who discussed their needs with a case manager at the inception of the Program, 95% (n=33) stated that their wraparound plan was conducive of their needs, while only 11.8% (n=4) stated that some items in their wraparound plan are difficult to understand. Finally, 97.5% (n=34) of participants believed that their wraparound plan will help them settle into Canada.

According to the resilience measures influenced by the PRYM (Pathways to Youth Resilience Measure), 90% (n=36) of survey respondents stated that the NWSP has helped them feel hopeful about the future; 85% (n=33) stated that the Program has helped them meet new friends; 82.7% (n=33) stated that the Program has helped them participate in programs and activities in their neighbourhood; and 80% (n=32) stated that the Program has helped them practice their culture, religion, values, and beliefs without feeling judged. In addition, 82.5% (n=32) of survey respondents stated that they believe their circumstances have improved since starting the NWSP and 77% (n=31) believed that they will be successful in Canada after completing the Program. With that said, most of the survey participants exhibited high levels of resilience.

The fidelity measures regarding wraparound plans and wraparound teams were correlated with the client resilience measures and indicated a strong positive relationship. Thereby, it can be assumed that the majority of survey respondents with high levels of resilience likely discussed their needs with a case manager at the inception of the Program, were satisfied with their wraparound team, and believed that their wraparound plan
will help them integrate into Greater Victoria. Such results would be in accordance with earlier postulations, wherein the researcher hypothesized that a wraparound approach cognizant of the various risks faced by immigrants and refugees that appropriately prioritizes clients’ needs and surrounds them with effective supports can transform risks into resilience and aid the successful integration of newcomers into society.

Interview findings appear to support this hypothesis. Of the five interview participants among Groups 1 and 2, three (60%) interview participants exhibited signs of resilience when describing their newcomer experiences, stating that they will not stop fighting for their basic human rights. When asked about the strengths of the NWSP, there were a number of causal relationships noted between resilience factors and overall client satisfaction. For example, Participant G1/2I1 explained, “…I don’t know what I would have done without VIRCS,” and Participant G1/2I4 stated, “If I didn’t know VIRCS, I probably would have died…” Participants G1/2I2 and G1/2I3 also admitted that VIRCS has helped them become stronger than they were before.

Another important factor for fostering resilience among wraparound clients noted in the literature was creating a sense of belonging. According to Benard (1995), environments that support the fulfillment of the most basic human needs can provide individuals faced with complex barriers the ability to meet their potential and feel a sense of belonging while being supported, connected, and respected (pp. 3-4). Comparatively, having a place that offers unconditional support without judgment was one of the most commonly cited aspects when Groups 1 and 2 interview participants were asked to describe their favourite part about the NWSP. For example, 100% (n=5) of interview participants in this Group mentioned that VIRCS has become their home or their family. Each participant referred to VIRCS as a place of refuge, a constant entity within a foreign land that offered help, warmth, and respect. According to Payne-Moss (2017), the wraparound team’s ability to meaningfully participate in the Program and foster a caring environment is an essential indicator of wraparound effectiveness (p. 74). Given the previous postulations noted in the goal attainment findings, wherein NWSP clients likely appreciate more informal processes of service delivery, perhaps the Settlement Team’s ability to foster a safe and secure environment among clients is a more crucial determinant of the NWSP’s effectiveness than having a structured wraparound plan. In fact, this hypothesis was substantiated by CDC in their study focused on creating a pathway toward an integrated immigrant service delivery system in Ontario. Herein, the researchers found that the atmosphere of settlement services should be made more comfortable and less formal in order for services to be more appealing and less intimidating (CDC, 2010, p. 34).

7.4 Wraparound Fidelity

Fidelity to the wraparound process is another component that has been deemed important to consider when measuring wraparound effectiveness. According to Shailer and colleagues (2017), measuring wraparound fidelity determines how adequately the wraparound process has been delivered in practice compared to its original specification or design (p. 87). Common wraparound fidelity measures include questions examining whether the wraparound approach has been implemented in accordance with the four phases and ten principles of wraparound theory (see Appendix A). Fidelity measures used in this study are summarized in Table 9 in accordance with the four phases of the wraparound approach. These measures were derived from the WFI (Wraparound Fidelity Index) noted in the literature review. To determine the wraparound fidelity of the NWSP, scores from the survey measures listed in Table 9 have been averaged, while findings from interviews have been used to supplement these data. Please note that these measures are not a comprehensive list of all wraparound fidelity indicators, given that this project considered more than just wraparound fidelity to evaluate the effectiveness of the NWSP. However, the calculations are useful in helping VIRCS establish a fidelity baseline that could be incorporated into future evaluation frameworks.

According to the calculations in Table 9, the NWSP has a fidelity score of 75.3%. Recall that Bruns and colleagues (2008) have conducted a study that provided baseline measures for wraparound fidelity, wherein a score between 85% and 100% indicates high fidelity; between 80% to 84% indicates above average fidelity; between 75% to 79% indicates average fidelity; between 70% to 74% indicates below average fidelity; and below 69% indicates zero fidelity to theoretical wraparound processes (pp. 242-249). With that said, the wraparound fidelity of the NWSP is average. Findings from Shailer and colleagues (2017) revealed that having
a successful implementation phase combined with strong principles of cultural competence and collaboration could lead to at least an average level or higher of wraparound fidelity, while an inadequate transition phase and insufficient natural supports on the wraparound team could hinder service delivery and prevent clients from achieving positive outcomes (p. 92). In accordance, the fidelity score of the NWSP’s implementation phase is 81.5%, which indicates an above average fidelity level. However, the fidelity score solely for the NWPS’s transition phase is 67.5%, while the score for the measure examining whether clients’ wraparound teams consist of natural supports is 57.5%, indicating zero fidelity.

**TABLE 9. PROJECT FIDELITY MEASURES IN ACCORDANCE WITH WRAPAROUND PHASES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: Engagement and Team Preparation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 3:</strong> Do you have a Wraparound Plan?</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>n=28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 6(a):</strong> When I began the Program, I met with a Case Manager to talk about my needs.</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>n=35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Question 1(c):</strong> Did you play a big role in creating your Wraparound Plan?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2: Initial Plan Development</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Question 1(b):</strong> Is your Wraparound Plan comprehensive of your hopes and dreams?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 6(c):</strong> I think that my Wraparound Plan will help me settle into Greater Victoria.</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>n=33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 6(g):</strong> My Wraparound Plan tries to help all members of my family as necessary.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>n=32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 6(h):</strong> Some things in my Wraparound Plan don’t make sense.</td>
<td>57.5%*</td>
<td>n=23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 6(b):</strong> Some members of my Wraparound Team are people I know, like friends and family.</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>n=23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 6(d):</strong> My Wraparound Team respects my culture, ethnicity, religion, values, etc.</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>n=34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 6(e):</strong> I am happy with my Wraparound Team.</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>n=34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 6(c):</strong> Sometimes I feel like people on my Wraparound Team don’t understand me.</td>
<td>65%*</td>
<td>n=26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Question 2:</strong> Are you comfortable with your Case Manager and Wraparound Team?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3: Implementation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Question 1(a):</strong> Are your needs effectively met throughout this Program?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Question 2(a):</strong> How often do you reflect on your progress during Wraparound Meetings?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Question 3(a):</strong> How often do you meet with your Case Manager and Wraparound Team?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 2:</strong> Do you meet at least every month or so with your Case Manager?</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>n=35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 6(i):</strong> During my Wraparound Meetings, I often write down my progress.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>n=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 6(j):</strong> The Program connects me to services that are really helpful.</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>n=37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 6(k):</strong> The Program helps solve my problems.</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>n=35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 6(l):</strong> The Program has made me feel welcome and safe in Canada.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>n=36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 4: Transition</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 6(m):</strong> I think I will be successful in Canada after I finish the Program.</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>n=31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 6(n):</strong> My Wraparound Team and I talked about what I will do after I finish the Program.</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>n=29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Question 6(o):</strong> I think the Program could end before my needs have been met.</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>n=21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Fidelity Score** 75.3%

*Inverse scores were calculated, as these measures were negative.

According to findings noted in the literature, these results should suggest that the NWSP may be effective in helping clients reach positive outcomes, albeit they could face challenges in accomplishing their goals (Bruns et al., 2008, pp. 242-249; Shailer et al., 2017, p. 92). However, when considering the findings regarding goal achievement, the literature does not entirely align with the current study. As noted in the findings, at least over half of the survey respondents stated that they have accomplished their goals, while the majority of survey respondents stated that their circumstances have improved since starting the NWSP. Furthermore, when Groups 1 and 2 interview participants were asked about the fidelity measures, successful goal attainment emerged as one of the strengths of the NWSP. For example, discussions with these participants uncovered that clients were significantly appreciative of the Program’s efforts to help them achieve their goals, regardless of how difficult the situation may have been.
Moreover, interviews with Group 3 revealed that the NWSP is committed to wraparound principles of individualization and goal orientation. In fact, 100% (n=6) of participants emphasized the importance of delivering client-centred services. Recall that the NWSP has an intake coordinator who reviews the needs of NWSP clients through a Needs Assessment administered by IRCC in order to prioritize the most urgent needs of clients and match them with appropriate case managers. Subsequently, the Settlement Team creates a skeleton of a wraparound plan that is shared with the client. However, participants from Group 3 often emphasized that the initial wraparound plan is merely a set of options presented to the client. Ultimately, it is the client’s decision to choose which of the options to implement. As Participant G3I3 noted, “I am just there to support and provide information and guidance. I don’t impose things. I put different options on the table and my clients pick what they need and I will support them.” Similarly, Participant G3I4 explained, “We don’t judge. We just try to show them options they can implement, but the decision clients make is ultimately dependent on them and their unique needs.”

With that said, it can be argued that a greater emphasis on clients’ needs rather than adherence to the theoretical principles of the wraparound approach is more effective in helping newcomers achieve their goals. This hypothesis is somewhat substantiated by the findings derived from interviews with Group 3. Recall that when participants were asked about their knowledge regarding the four phases and ten principles of the wraparound approach, most participants had some awareness of these theoretical foundations; however, many admitted that the NWSP does not strictly adhere to these formal processes due to its adaptive and flexible nature. According to Participant G3I1, “We follow these phases in some way, but I have learned about this Program in more practical ways, like through working directly with clients and seeking direction from senior staff.” Participant G3I3 echoed these remarks by stating, “Wraparound is flexible. Nothing is absolute,” and Participant G3I4 commented, “We do have this framework, but I don’t know if we strictly follow it…our main goal is to help.” A greater emphasis on clients’ needs as an important determinant of success is also supported by Payne-Moss (2017), who found that when two or more need statements are identified in a wraparound plan and are addressed through natural and formal supports, the wraparound process can positively impact outcomes (p. 83). It can be assumed that effectively addressing clients’ needs requires a certain level of flexibility, which is a strength of the NWSP that has been noted in 100% (n=11) of the interviews conducted.

Despite these analyses, the ability of wraparound fidelity to impact positive outcomes should not be dismissed. One of the opportunities for improvement noted in findings with Groups 1 and 2 interview participants was having a stronger adherence to wraparound fidelity. While 100% (n=5) of participants stated that they do not have a formal wraparound plan, 60% (n=3) believed that it would be a useful tool to have in the future, once they understood its meaning. In addition, 66.7% (n=4) of Group 3 interview participants explained that there are formal wraparound training sessions available throughout B.C. for program administrators; however, there did not appear to be any formal trainings administered at VIRCS. As such, an approach to enhance Program effectiveness may be for the Settlement Team to adhere to the theoretical underpinnings of wraparound to a greater extent, while balancing clients’ collectivist nature and preference for more meaningful and casual interactions.

### 7.5 Working Alliance

Working alliance is another theme that was commonly referred to as a success indicator among the literature. Hatcher and Gillapsy (2006) explain that alliance must be a collaborative feature of the client and the team, comprised of agreement regarding the goals of the wraparound process, the client’s approval of the strategies enlisted within the wraparound plan, and the quality of interpersonal bond between the client and the team (p. 12). Further findings from the literature suggest that the successful delivery of the wraparound approach requires a positive working alliance between the client, team, and case manager (Bruns et al., 2015, p. 317; Giatrelis, 2017, pp. 58-59; Hatcher & Gillapsy, 2007, p. 15). The results from this study are in accordance with this statement. Findings regarding working alliance have been noted in Table 6. Specific measures regarding working alliance were influenced by the WAI (Working Alliance Inventory) and have been implemented in the form of questions 6(b) through 6(e). According to these results, 85% (n=34) of survey respondents stated that they are happy with their wraparound team and believed that their wraparound team is respectful of their...
culture, ethnicity, and values. In addition, 65% (n=26) of participants claimed that their wraparound team is comprehensive of their needs, while 26.9% (n=4) of participants noted that their favourite part about the NWSP is their case manager.

Perhaps, these positive results are due to the majority of participants’ wraparound teams containing natural and formal supports. As previously noted, the literature review revealed that having a wraparound team composed of natural and formal supports who foster meaningful relationships is essential for wraparound success (Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 73; Shailer et al., 2017, p. 92). Accordingly, 57.5% (n=23) of survey respondents stated that some members of their wraparound team were natural supports, such as friends and family. Furthermore, participants with a wraparound plan had more natural supports on their team than participants without a wraparound plan and also reported better working relationships with their wraparound team, indicating that a lack of natural supports on clients’ wraparound team could result in lower perceptions of positive working alliance. In addition, recall that case managers have been identified as formal supports (Payne-Moss, 2017, p. 56). Findings from the interviews with Groups 1 and 2 revealed that having devoted case managers was one of the most prominent indicators of positive working alliance. For example, 100% (n=5) of participants appeared grateful for their case manager’s ability to connect with them on a human level through compassion, genuine devotion to their needs, and selfless acts of kindness. As Participant G1/2I4 stated, “Meeting people who care about me and are trying to genuinely help me is so encouraging.” Such comments align with findings from Giarelis (2017), who found associations between wraparound clients’ appreciation toward their case manager’s dedication to act on their best interest and high levels of working alliance (p. 56).

Furthermore, the literature states that clients who have a positive working alliance with their case manager tend to hold optimistic perceptions of their wraparound team and exhibit gratefulness toward their case manager, despite having a number of unattained goals (Giarelis, 2017, p. 55). Accordingly, interview findings with Groups 1 and 2 revealed that when VIRCS was unable to provide solutions to their problems, clients remained appreciative of the organization and its employees. For example, Participant G1/2I4 stated, “VIRCS staff care so much and they will try to help, until they no longer can. VIRCS staff are only human. I just wanted to clarify that they are good. I was a client here for many years, so I know the staff, and how hard they try to make things better for their clients.” Similarly, Participant G1/2I5 stated, “I still struggle…I have a lot of health issues I am still dealing with. However, all the people here are so friendly, and they treat me so well…I will never leave my case manager, because I really need him.” Further, Participant G1/2I2 explained, “I have a really good relationship with my wraparound team, because they were there for me during my hardest times, and they are continually there for me. They have never refused to help me with anything, even when my needs were beyond their control, they still attempted their best to improve my situation.”

Group 3 interview participants also noted their clients’ gratitude toward their efforts in the face of adversity. For example, Participant G3I4 stated, “I think my clients are really pleased, although they wish we could have more resources.” In addition, high levels of working alliance among Group 3 participants were exemplified through strong communication between members of the Settlement Team, the implementation of appropriate conflict resolution techniques, and an organized process of service delivery. These comments are in accordance with Hatcher and Gillapsy’s (2007) emphasis on practicing collaboration and having a strong interpersonal bond between the client and the team in order to achieve high levels of working alliance (p. 12).

Moreover, Hawley and Weisz (2010) found that a positive working alliance between clients and service providers may be a key process underlying client retention, overall satisfaction, and positive outcomes (p. 118). With that said, a positive working alliance between clients and their case managers was also exemplified through clients’ willingness to remain in the Program. According to interview findings, approximately 20% of clients were returning clients, while 100% (n=5) of participants from Groups 1 and 2 have been enrolled in the NWSP for over a year. Interview participants from Group 3 also noted that clients will often return if other barriers arise and case managers will welcome them with open arms.

Overall, these findings indicate that an emphasis on the development of the bond between clients and their case managers may be a more effective approach among newcomers in regard to working alliance than ensuring that case managers are appropriately trained to administer the NWSP.
7.6 Overall Client Satisfaction with the Wraparound Process

The final element common among variables measuring the effectiveness of wraparound approaches is overall client satisfaction. The literature has found that clients who feel involved in the development of their wraparound plan and share meaningful relationships with their wraparound team frequent the wraparound program more often, thereby exhibiting higher levels of satisfaction (LaPorte et al., 2016, p. 626; Rosen et al., 1994, p. 65; Walker et al., 2012, p. 196). Satisfaction measures administered through the survey were influenced by the YFIT (Youth and Family Involvement in Teams) measure noted in the literature review.

In general, 87.5% (n=35) of survey respondents reported feeling satisfied with the NWSP, and those with a wraparound plan appeared more satisfied with the Program than participants without a wraparound plan. For example, 63% (n=17) of participants with a wraparound plan were very satisfied with their wraparound team, compared to 12.5% (n=1) of participants without a wraparound plan. In addition, 82.5% (n=33) of participants reported meeting their needs and believing that their circumstances have improved due to the Program; and 80% (n=32) reported feeling satisfied with the progress they have made since starting the Program. Furthermore, 100% (n=35) of participants who reported feeling satisfied with the NWSP stated that they met with a wraparound coordinator to discuss their needs at the inception of the Program and were happy with their wraparound team. Moreover, 91.4% (n=32) of respondents who reported feeling satisfied with the NWSP and 97.1% (n=34) of participants who reported feeling satisfied with their wraparound team visited their case manager at least once a month, while 100% (n=7) of participants who meet with their case manager multiple times a month stated that they were satisfied with the progress they have made since starting the NWSP, compared to zero participants who never meet with their case manager.

Interview findings with Groups 1 and 2 participants have revealed causal relationships between client satisfaction and a sense of belonging, which can be presumed as having a meaningful relationship with the wraparound team. Furthermore, 100% (n=5) of participants stated that VIRCS, their case manager, and the Settlement Team have become their second home or their family, and 100% (n=5) of the participants also stated that they were extremely satisfied with the Program. In fact, 40% (n=2) of participants explained that they did not have any recommendations for improvement because they were very satisfied with the Program, specifically its ability to connect with others and its tireless efforts to help newcomers in need. In light of these findings, it is useful to note that the most frequent query term returned when coding Groups 1 and 2 interviews with NVivo was “thankful.” Accordingly, 100% (n=6) of Group 3 participants commented on the importance of delivering client-centred services that elicit clients’ voices and recognize their strengths. In addition, each of the Group 3 participants stated that their clients were generally satisfied with the Program and would often strive to maintain connections, even after transitioning from the NWSP.

Another component related to high levels of client satisfaction cited in the literature is the availability of diverse and flexible services. A study conducted by LaPorte and colleagues (2016) revealed that having integrated services, wherein clients had the opportunity to interact with various service providers or engage in multiple activities, resulted in greater levels of satisfaction and self-determination (p. 626). The current findings resemble this notion. For example, a greater proportion of enrolled clients reported feeling satisfied with the NWSP, compared to former clients. Consequently, these results could potentially indicate that being wrapped around a multitude of services in a supportive environment may have an impact on client satisfaction levels. Participants who leave the Program and are required to face new integration barriers on their own may experience decreased satisfaction levels with the Program due to a lack of readily available services. However, immigration barriers are a continuous cycle, as they stem from systemic gaps in the broader community. As such, the Program is unable to ensure that former clients will never face an integration barrier again. Nevertheless, as Group 3 interview participants noted, if former clients wish to return to VIRCS for additional help, they are always welcome.

The availability of diverse and flexible services was also noted as a strength among all interview participants, in addition to 97.5% (n=37) of survey respondents. For example, interview participants from Groups 1 and 2 admitted that VIRCS’ ability to connect them to appropriate community resources, including counsellors and
lawyers, conduct useful workshops, and offer childcare, food stamps, and bus passes were very useful in helping them face barriers to settlement and integration. In addition, discussions regarding wraparound fidelity highlighted the flexibility of services and its ability to adapt to clients’ needs. These factors were causally linked through Participant G1/2I1, who stated his high level of satisfaction with the Program was connected to resources VIRCS provided to help him cope with multiple barriers. Furthermore, when Groups 1 and 2 interview participants were asked about their satisfaction with the Program, 80% (n=4) explained that they were satisfied with the NWSP because of the various community connections the Program helped them achieve, which ultimately influenced their ability to accomplish their goals. Similarly, 100% (n=6) of Group 3 interview participants rationalized that their clients were pleased with the NWSP because of the variety of integration and settlement resources they could access through the Program.

Interestingly, despite appreciation for the availability of diverse and flexible services, a suggestion among all research participants was to deliver a greater variety of services and hire additional professionals to supplement the Settlement Team, such as lawyers and counsellors. However, in order to implement these suggestions, significant monetary resources are required. Nevertheless, interviews with all research participants revealed that the Program is in need of more funds. Case managers reported being underpaid, overwhelmed, and frustrated at the lack of readily available resources within the community. For example, Participant G3I3 stated, “We need increased funding. There are conditions set by the federal government that limit us in what we can do with the funding we receive. Sometimes we don’t always have sufficient resources to adequately help our clients. In the past, we had some resources to offer first aid certifications, food safe, serving it right, and many more training opportunities. These are no longer available…In addition, case managers often leave because they are underpaid for the amount of work that they do.” Participant G3I5 also explained, “…I think if the government could provide more funding for mental health, housing, daycare, and ESL classes, things would be better for newcomers,” while participant G1/2 echoed, “If VIRCS had more funding, they could hire different types of settlement workers, like lawyers and counsellors.” In light of these findings, it may be useful for VIRCS to consider a diversified funding stream to increase funds and supplement a greater variety of services and settlement workers in effort to preserve high levels of satisfaction among clients and maintain client retention.

7.7 Summary: Answering the Research Questions

As noted in Chapter 3, this study administered surveys and interviews among NWSP service providers and service receivers to determine the present state of the NWSP in accordance with goal attainment, client resilience, wraparound fidelity, working alliance, and overall client satisfaction. In total, 29 enrolled clients and 11 former clients participated in the survey and five enrolled clients in addition to six members of the Settlement Team participated in interviews. According to findings in the literature, the aforementioned measures are important indicators of wraparound success. Essentially, high levels in one measure should be positively correlated with high levels in the remaining measures in order to adequately claim program effectiveness. Findings noted throughout this chapter for each of the measures have been averaged to provide an overall understanding of the NWSP in accordance with the tested success indicators.

Overall, survey findings generated average levels of 64.8% goal attainment; 85% client resilience; 75.3% wraparound fidelity; 69.3% working alliance; and 82.5% client satisfaction. Evidently, over half of the survey participants provided high rankings for these measures. Results from interview findings resemble these scores. Therefore, it can be argued that the NWSP is quite effective in delivering its services. However, there remain opportunities for improvement within the Program that could potentially increase clients’ experience and influence improved outcomes. As such, Table 10 has been created to describe the current state of the NWSP, highlight aspects that are working well, and provide suggestions for improvement.
## TABLE 10. ANSWERING THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

### HOW EFFECTIVE IS THE NWSP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current State Derived from the Evaluation Survey</th>
<th>Average Goal Attainment Level: 64.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The NWSP has helped 68% (n=27) of participants learn the Canadian banking system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NWSP has helped 68% (n=27) of participants go to school or acquire recognition for their foreign education documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NWSP has helped 60% (n=24) of participants find a suitable job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NWSP has helped 60% (n=24) of participants address issues with their immigration documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NWSP has helped 57.5% (n=23) of participants acquire appropriate medical documents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NWSP has helped 55% (n=22) of participants find suitable housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The NWSP has improved 82.5% (n=33) of participants’ circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.5% (n=21) of participants believed the NWSP will help them meet their needs before they transition out of the Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current State Derived from Interview Findings

- 100% (n=5) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants stated that the NWSP has helped them accomplish at least some of their goals.
- 100% (n=5) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants stated that the Settlement Team is committed to helping them succeed.
- 100% (n=5) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants stated that their circumstances have improved because of the NWSP.
- 100% (n=6) of Group 3 interview participants stated that they are committed to allowing their clients make their own decisions regarding goal attainment.
- 100% (n=6) of Group 3 interview participants stated that former clients will return to share their success stories.

### Identified Strengths

- The NWSP has dedicated and compassionate case managers.
  - 29.6% (n=4) of survey respondents stated that their favourite part about the NWSP was having dedicated case managers.
  - 100% (n=5) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants appreciated their case manager’s willingness to help them succeed, regardless of how difficult the circumstance may be.
  - 50% (n=3) of Group 3 interview participants cited having passionate service providers to deliver the wraparound approach as a strength of the NWSP.
- The NWSP offers diverse and flexible services.
  - 97.5% (n=37) of survey respondents stated that the NWSP has connected them to helpful resources in the community.
  - 100% (n=5) of Group 3 interview participants admitted that the Program’s ability to connect them to appropriate community resources, including counsellors and lawyers, conduct useful workshops, and offer childcare services, food stamps, and bus passes were very useful in helping them face their barriers to settlement and integration.
  - 83% (n=5) of Group 3 interview participants mentioned having diverse and flexible services as a strength of the NWSP. Examples noted include: outreach services; home visits; group sessions; one-on-one services; crisis intervention services; child care services; and employment skills training.
- The Settlement Team is outcome-based.
  - 100% (n=6) of Group 3 interview participants described an outcome-based approach to service delivery.
- VIRCS is recommended by other community members.
  - 80% (n=4) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants approached VIRCS due to an external recommendation.

### Suggested Improvements

- Broaden use of community resources.
  - 25% (n=10) of survey respondents identified the need for more resources.
  - 40% (n=2) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants suggested the need for a greater variety of service providers, such as lawyers and specialized training (i.e. first aid, serve it at right, etc.).
  - 40% (n=2) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants suggested having a greater variety of workshops, such as cooking classes and various activities for kids.
  - Create a diversification funding stream to increase available resources.
100% (n=6) of Group 3 interview participants explained that they strive to make the most of available resources. Nevertheless, the need for more funding to implement a greater variety of workshops, hire more case managers, increase the wages of case managers, and offer formalized training were often suggested as opportunities for improvement.

### CLIENT RESILIENCE

#### Current State

**Average Client Resilience Level: 85%**

- 97.5% (n=34) of participants believed that their wraparound plan will help them settle into Canada.
- 90% (n=36) of participants stated that the NWSP has helped them feel hopeful about the future.
- 85% (n=33) of participants stated that the Program has helped them meet new friends.
- 82.7% (n=33) of participants stated that the Program has helped them participate in programs and activities in their neighbourhood.
- 80% (n=32) of participants stated that the Program has helped them practice their culture, religion, values, and beliefs without feeling judged.
- 82.5% (n=32) of participants stated that they believe their circumstances have improved since starting the NWSP.
- 77% (n=31) of participants believed that they will be successful in Canada after completing the Program.

**Current State Derived from Interview Findings**

- 60% (n=3) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants have exhibited signs of resilience when describing their newcomer experiences.
- The Settlement Team is effective at creating a sense of belonging among clients, as 100% (n=5) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants referred to VIRCS as a second home or family.

#### Identified Strengths

- VIRCS is an environment that can fulfill clients’ most basic human needs, thereby providing individuals faced with complex barriers the ability to meet their potential and feel a sense of belonging while being supported, connected, and respected.
- 30.8% (n=12) of participants mentioned having a welcoming and supportive environment as a strength of the NWSP.
- 100% (n=5) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants mentioned having a place that offers unconditional support without judgement as a strength of the NWSP.

#### Suggested Improvements

- Engage in employee training that supports the development of meaningful relationships.
- Ensure that wraparound teams and wraparound plans adhere to the ten principles of the wraparound approach.

### WRAPAROUND FIDELITY

**Average Wraparound Fidelity Level: 75.3%**

#### Current State

**Current State Derived from the Evaluation Survey**

- 87.5% (n=35) of participants met with a case manager at the beginning of the Program to discuss their needs.
- Participants with a wraparound plan reported better relationships with their wraparound team and held more positive perceptions regarding their integration process than participants without a wraparound plan.
- See Table 10 for additional data.

**Current State Derived from Interview Findings**

- 100% (n=5) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants did not fully understand the meaning of a wraparound plan.
- 60% (n=3) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants stated that having a wraparound plan would be a useful tool in the future.
- 66.7% (n=4) of Group 3 interview participants had some awareness of wraparound theory; however, all six of the participants admitted that the NWSP does not strictly adhere to these formal processes due to its adaptive and flexible nature.
- 66.7% (n=4) of Group 3 interview participants explained that there are formal wraparound training sessions available throughout B.C. for program administrators; however, there did not appear to be any formal trainings administered at VIRCS.

#### Identified Strengths

- The intake coordinator is effective at prioritizing clients’ needs through an intake assessment.
- 75% (n=26) of survey respondents who discussed their needs with the intake coordinator stated that their wraparound team is comprised of natural supports, such as friends and family; 97.5% (n=34) believed that their wraparound team was respectful of their culture, ethnicity, religion and
values and claimed to be happy with their wraparound team; 65% (n=26) stated that they feel understood by their wraparound team; 95% (n=33) stated that their wraparound plan was conducive of their needs; and 88.2% (n=35) claimed to fully understand their wraparound plan.

Case managers adhere to the outcome-based and client-centred principles of wraparound theory.

- 100% (n=5) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants commented on their wraparound team’s willingness to help them succeed.
- 100% (n=6) of Group 3 interview participants emphasized the importance of delivering client-centred services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offer formal training and orientation to case managers regarding the wraparound approach in order to help the Settlement Team adhere to theoretical underpinnings, while balancing clients’ preference for more meaningful and casual interactions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WORKING ALLIANCE

#### Current State

**Average Working Alliance Level: 69.3%**

**Current State Derived from the Evaluation Survey**

- 85% (n=34) of participants stated that they are happy with their wraparound team and believed that their wraparound team is respectful of their culture, ethnicity, and values.
- 65% (n=26) of participants claimed that their wraparound team is understanding of their needs.
- 26.9% (n=4) of participants noted that their favourite part about the NWSP is their case manager.
- 57.5% (n=23) of participants stated that some members of their wraparound team were natural supports, such as friends and family.
- 40% (n=4) of participants without a wraparound plan claimed to be misunderstood by their wraparound team, compared to 16.2% (n=4) of participants with a wraparound plan, meaning that participants with a wraparound plan had a better relationship with their wraparound team than participants without a wraparound plan.
- 77% (n=20) of participants with a wraparound plan stated to have natural supports on their wraparound team, compared to 42.9% (n=3) of participants without a wraparound plan.
- 63% (n=17) of participants with a wraparound plan were very satisfied with their wraparound team, compared to 12.5% (n=1) of participants without a plan.

**Current State Derived from Interview Findings**

- 100% (n=5) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants stated that they had a good relationship with their case manager and their wraparound team.
- 83.3% (n=5) of Group 3 interview participants cited strong working alliance as an asset of the NWSP.

In addition to the flexibility, availability, and cultural competence of case managers, working alliance was exemplified through strong communication among the Settlement Team, the implementation of appropriate conflict resolution techniques, and an organized process of service delivery.

#### Identified Strengths

The NWSP has dedicated case managers, who contribute to high levels of working alliance.

- Interviews with Groups 1 and 2 revealed that having devoted case managers was one of the most prominent indicators of positive working alliance. For example, 100% (n=5) of participants appeared grateful for their case manager’s ability to connect with them on a human level through compassion, genuine devotion to their needs, and selfless acts of kindness.

The NWSP has culturally competent case managers, who contribute to high levels of working alliance.

- The majority of survey respondents noted that the Program has allowed them to practice their religion, culture, and values without feeling judged. For example, 100% (n=3) of Middle Eastern respondents, 96.6% (n=22) of Asian respondents, and 87.5% (n=7) of Black/African respondents stated that the Program has allowed them to practice their background unconditionally.

- 60% (n=3) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants appeared grateful for their case manager’s ability to connect with them on a human level and use relevant resources to help them in any way possible. Participants were also grateful for their case manager’s compassion and ability to care for them unconditionally.

- 60% (n=3) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants expressed appreciation for VIRCS’ ability to understand their circumstance.

#### Suggested Improvements

- Hire additional case managers with diverse backgrounds.

### OVERALL CLIENT SATISFACTION

#### Current State

**Average Client Satisfaction Level: 82.5%**

**Current State Derived from the Evaluation Survey**
87.5% (n=35) of participants reported feeling satisfied with the NWSP, and those with a wraparound plan appeared more satisfied with the Program than participants without a wraparound plan. For example, 63% (n=17) of participants with a wraparound plan were very satisfied with their wraparound team, compared to 12.5% (n=1) of participants without a wraparound plan.

82.5% (n=33) of participants reported meeting their needs and believing that their circumstances have improved due to the Program.

80% (n=32) of participants reported feeling satisfied with the progress they have made since starting the Program. All participants who reported feeling satisfied with the NWSP stated that they met with a wraparound coordinator to discuss their needs at the inception of the Program and were happy with their wraparound team, and 91.4% (n=32) who reported feeling satisfied with the NWSP and 97.1% (n=34) who reported feeling satisfied with their wraparound team visited their case manager at least once a month.

100% (n=7) of participants who meet with their case manager multiple times a month stated that they were satisfied with the progress they have made since starting the NWSP, compared to zero participants who never meet with their case manager.

**Current State Derived from the Interview Findings**

- Interview findings with Groups 1 and 2 interview participants have revealed causal relationships between client satisfaction and a sense of belonging, which can be presumed as having a meaningful relationship with the wraparound team.
- 100% (n=5) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants stated that VIRCS, their case manager, and the Settlement Team have become their second home or their family, and 100% (n=5) of the participants also stated that they were extremely satisfied with the Program.
- 40% (n=2) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants explained that they did not have any recommendations for improvement because they were very satisfied with the Program, specifically its ability to connect with others and its tireless efforts to help newcomers in need.
- The most frequent query term returned when coding Groups 1 and 2 interviews with NVivo was “thankful.”
- 100% (n=6) of Group 3 interview participants commented on the importance of delivering client-centred services that elicit clients’ voices and recognize their strengths.
- 100% of Group 3 interview participants stated that their clients were generally satisfied with the Program and would often strive to maintain connections, even after transitioning from the NWSP.

**Identified Strengths**

- The availability of diverse and flexible services within the NWSP contributes to high levels of client satisfaction.
  - A greater proportion of enrolled clients reported feeling satisfied with the NWSP, compared to former clients. These results could potentially indicate that being wrapped around a multitude of services in a supportive environment may have an impact on client satisfaction levels.
  - The availability of diverse and flexible services was noted as a strength among all interview participants (n=11), in addition to 97.5% (n=37) of survey respondents.
  - 80% (n=4) of Groups 1 and 2 interview participants explained that they were satisfied with the NWSP because of the various community connections the Program has helped them achieve.
  - 100% (n=6) of Group 3 interview participants rationalized that their clients were pleased with the NWSP because of the variety of integration and settlement resources they could access through the Program.

**Suggested Improvements**

- Sustain current community connections and invest into building a broader network with the B.C. settlement sector in order to preserve high levels of satisfaction among clients and maintain client retention.
8.0 Recommendations

8.1 Introduction

With respect to answering the remaining two research questions, this study has produced three recommendations that VIRCS could explore between 2020 and 2023 in order to maintain NWSP effectiveness and further improve the experiences and outcomes of vulnerable newcomers. The remaining two research questions include:

- What are immediate, short-term recommendations for improvement and additional, long-term recommendations for improvement?
- How can changes be implemented in consideration of monetary funds, human resources, and time?

The first recommendation suggests using the findings of this study to design an evaluation framework that could be implemented on an annual basis in order to monitor the progress of the NWSP. Given that the information derived from this study is readily available, this recommendation would be quite plausible within the next year. A potential evaluation framework has been developed for VIRCS in Appendix E. The second recommendation is to establish a staff retention and recruitment strategy premised on ensuring that current case managers enjoy a healthy work environment, while cultural competencies and sound knowledge of the wraparound approach are exhibited in future employees.

The third recommendation suggests the establishment of a diversified funding stream for the NWSP. To this extent, the knowledge of the researcher is limited, given that this study explored the effectiveness of the NWSP instead of the plausibility of implementing a diversified funding stream. However, the interview findings have revealed that case managers can face roadblocks when attempting to help clients reach their goals due to limited resources within the Program and in the broader community. The interview findings also revealed that job insecurity could lead to unnecessary stress among employees, which may affect case manager’s ability to remain dedicated and devoted to their clients, thereby impacting the effectiveness of service delivery. Consequently, a contributor to program effectiveness may be the implementation of a diversified funding stream, wherein the organization receives funds from a variety of entities to support the NWSP, instead of solely being funded by IRCC. This chapter briefly discusses how these recommendations may be implemented given the current state of the NWSP, in addition to highlighting areas for continued research.

8.2 Recommendations

**RECOMMENDATIONS 1: DESIGN AND IMPLEMENT AN EVALUATION FRAMEWORK FOR THE NWSP (2020-2021)**

One of the best practices VIRCS could implement to maintain program effectiveness is a periodic program evaluation. According to the Treasury Board Secretariat of Canada (TBS) (n. d.), measuring performance is an essential link in a program cycle, given that evaluations can produce timely, relevant, credible, and objective findings on program performance when valid and reliable data is collected (p. 1). While this project conducted an evaluation of program effectiveness, it was purely exploratory with the purpose of generating data on the current state of the NWSP, aspects that are working well, and areas that could be improved. Given that there is an abundance of recent and reliable data available due to the study – primarily the information summarized in Table 10 – VIRCS could use the findings to create a robust evaluation plan that could be implemented each year to measure program effectiveness. Recall that the NWSP operates on a three-term cycle, wherein a report must be issued in the fourth quarter to IRCC in order to determine continued funding for the Program. Including evaluation data about the functionality of the Program could strengthen the funding proposal.

There are three phases to an evaluation: (1) evaluation framework; (2) evaluation study; and (3) decision-making based on findings and recommendations (TBS, n. d., pp. 1-2). These phases can be accomplished through an evaluation plan, which describes the reason the evaluation is being conducted, necessary activities
that must occur, roles and responsibilities of those involved, the evaluation timeframe, and how findings will be used (Alberta Health Services, n. d., p. 1). The evaluation is completed through presenting relevant evaluation questions linked to program objectives and performance measures. To operationalize these questions, the identification of corresponding outputs\(^{11}\), outcomes\(^{12}\), and associated indicators\(^{13}\) is necessary for each question (University of Arkansas, n. d., p. 8). These tools should be implemented to measure the continued relevance of the program, program results, and cost-effectiveness (TBS, n. d., p. 4). These three factors can be captured through the questions introduced in Table 11. These questions could be answered through the creation of an evaluation framework. As previously noted, an evaluation framework for the NWSP has been provided in Appendix E in the form of a logic model.

**TABLE 11. OPERATIONALIZATION OF CONTINUED RELEVANCE, PROGRAM RESULTS, AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS**

| Continued Relevance of the Program | To what extent are the objectives and mandate of the program still relevant?  
| Program Results | Are the activities and outputs consistent with the program’s mandate and plausibly linked to the objectives or intended results?  
| Cost-Effectiveness | In what manner and to what extent were appropriate objectives achieved as a result of the program?  
| | What client benefits and intended/unintended outcomes resulted from implementing the program?  
| | In what manner and to what extent does the program complement, duplicate, or overlap with other programs?  
| | Are there more cost-effective alternatives that might achieve the objectives and intended results?  
| | Are there more cost-effective ways of delivering the existing program?  

Source: Adapted from TBS, n. d., pp. 4-5

Considerations regarding the implementation of this framework include the availability of resources (University of Arkansas, n. d., p. 10). The resources VIRCS has available will have the greatest influence on the evaluation plan. VIRCS will need to consider:

- **Temporal Resources** – Whose time and how much of it is available to work on an evaluation? What priority will the evaluation have in employees’ workload? Involving volunteers, university students, or participants may be a way to disperse the workload (University of Arkansas, n. d., p. 10). It is recommended that VIRCS continue offering the program evaluation as a capstone opportunity for master’s students in order to save monetary resources.

- **Monetary Resources** – What are the monetary resources available to print questionnaires, pay for postage, reimburse or incentivize participants, and analyze the data? This study cost the researcher approximately $2,500.00. It is recommended that VIRCS incorporate an additional $2,500.00 into its funding proposal to IRCC to support the evaluation.

- **Human Resources** – Constructing the evaluation instrument or analyzing the data may require expertise unavailable in the organization, or there may be others with experience and knowledge related to the program who could increase the evaluation’s credibility (University of Arkansas, n. d., p. 10). It is recommended that VIRCS consider the evaluation framework in Appendix E, incorporate changes as necessary, and transform it into its evaluation instrument.

- **Sources of Information** – Sources of information could include existing information, people, and observations. Examples of existing information are previous evaluations, such as this report; the NWSP’s iCare, wherein all case managers report their progress to IRCC; and printed material about the Program. Examples of people include the NWSP’s clients. There are also a range of other human resources that could be utilized, such as nonparticipants, proponents and critics, key informants, program staff and collaborators, legislators, funders, and policy makers (University of Arkansas, n. d., p. 10). Direct observations of program events, activities, and results could also be powerful sources of

---

\(^{11}\) Outputs refer to the size and scope of the services delivered or produced by a program, for example number of workshops and number of participants attending (Alberta Health Services, n. d., p. 2).

\(^{12}\) Outcomes refer to the changes in attitudes, behaviours, knowledge, skills, status, or level of functioning expected to result from program activities (Alberta Health Services, n. d., p. 2).

\(^{13}\) Indicators are specific measures indicating the point at which goals and/or objectives have been achieved. Often, indicators are proxies for goals and objectives which cannot be directly measured (Alberta Health Services, n. d., p. 2).
information. It is recommended that VIRCS use clients and the Settlement Team as sources of information, similar to this capstone project. In addition, it is recommended that VIRCS partner with other wraparound programs throughout Canada to inform its evaluation (see Suggested Next Steps).

**Data Collection Methods** – There are multiple data collection methods available, including surveys and interviews. It is recommended that VIRCS re-distribute the evaluation survey and use the interview guides from this study to engage program administrators and clients in casual interviews during wraparound meetings. It may also be useful for the Settlement Team to record activities in a shared data log that can be consulted during the evaluation period, in addition to examining formal reports produced through iCare.

**Data Analysis** – Organizing, tabulating, and analyzing data to permit meaningful interpretation requires time and effort. If resources are limited, VIRCS may want to structure its evaluation to be smaller, rather than larger. The aim of data analysis is to synthesize information to make sense of it (University of Arkansas, n. d., p. 13). Different techniques are appropriate depending on the nature of the data (i.e. qualitative vs. quantitative). The researcher used NVivo to transcribe, code, and analyze the qualitative information and SPSS to generate descriptive statistics. One NVivo 12 PRO licence costs $1,278.37 CAD for non-profit organizations, whereas a monthly SPSS base subscription costs $124.00 CAD. However, the Coding Analysis Toolkit is a free software to effectively code raw data, annotate coding, assign multiple coders to specific tasks, measure interrater reliability, and validate coding results (Pat Research, 2018, para. 8). In addition, Microsoft Excel can conduct the same basic analyzes as SPSS and is already included into VIRCS’ computers. It is recommended that VIRCS download the free Coding Analysis Toolkit to analyze interview data and use Microsoft Excel to produce statistical analyses of survey data.

**Communication Plan** – It is recommended that VIRCS communicate the results of the evaluation in the funding proposal provided to IRCC at the end of each fiscal year, in addition to uploading a summary of evaluation findings to its website. Sharing evaluation findings publicly could increase donations from funders, as it legitimizes the operations of an organization.

Overall, it is recommended that VIRCS consider the suggestions in each of these considerations and use them to refine the evaluation framework in Appendix E. The federal government’s fiscal calendar is between April 1 and March 31. All funding proposals must be submitted prior to March 31. It is recommended that the evaluation framework be implemented between October 2020 and December 2020 in order to inform the funding proposal for March 2021. Case managers could begin collecting data for evaluation at the beginning of the first intake in April and begin analyzing the results in December to prepare for the final report in March. The data will reflect the accomplishments in the previous year and highlight areas where additional funding is required to strengthen the NWSP. Depending on the success of this report to generate support from IRCC and other stakeholders, the evaluation framework could be implemented on an ongoing, yearly basis.

**Suggested Next Steps** – Partner with other immigration and settlement sectors across Canada that have implemented a wraparound approach to service delivery to examine comparison groups in effort of establishing more robust baseline data for a formal impact evaluation framework. This research could also inform the development of more refined goals, objectives, strategies, performance indicators, and targets to be implemented into future evaluations of program effectiveness. Potential stakeholders could be:

- **The Association for New Canadians (ANC)** – A non-profit, community-based organization delivering settlement and integration services to immigrants and refugees in Newfoundland and Labrador (ANC, 2019, para. 1). In 2018, LIFT Philanthropy Partners (LIFT) selected ANC as one of the 10 Canadian immigrant-serving organizations in Canada who would receive funding from LIFT and IRCC to expand their capacity and reach to deliver real change. ANC was primarily selected for delivering effective wraparound services to newcomers (LIFT, 2018, para. 7).

- **The London Intercommunity Health Centre (LIHC)** – Provides the wraparound service to immigrant senior clients. This Program has been found to have experienced and professionally trained staff and has resulted in positive outcomes among newcomers (Jonquil Eyre Consulting, 2009, p. 72).

- **MOSAIC** – A registered charity serving immigrant, refugee, migrant, and mainstream communities in Greater Vancouver and the Fraser Valley. In June of 2017, MOSAIC launched a wraparound program...
in collaboration with Public Safety Canada to assist at-risk youth in Vancouver to overcome their challenges (MOSAIC, 2017, para. 1).

**Recommendation 2: Establish an Employee Recruitment and Retention Strategy (2020-2022)**

To address opportunities for improvement derived from interview findings that suggest an overwhelming work environment for case managers and a lack of formalized orientation to the wraparound approach, VIRCS could establish an employee recruitment and retention strategy. The recruitment portion of the strategy could focus on attracting trained professionals in wraparound with high levels of cultural competence and problem-solving skills, while the retention portion of the strategy could focus on implementing appropriate resources to help staff manage stress and engage in team building.

**Staff Recruitment**

According to the National Wraparound Implementation Center (NWIC) (2014), an effective path to follow in the recruitment of case managers is staff selection, training, supervision and coaching, and performance management (p. 7). The job description should focus on: (1) ability to maintain a strengths-based orientation; (2) ability to read the social cues of others; (3) ability to communicate in a respectful manner; (4) ability to adapt based on new information; (5) ability to be collaborative and work with others; (6) ability to manage conflict and various agendas/personalities effectively; (7) ability to organize and multitask; (8) comfortability with ambiguity; (9) ability to blend and integrate multiple perspectives; and (10) ability to track and monitor progress (NWIC, 2014, p. 12). As derived from the literature and research findings, staff selection should also give preference to applicants with high levels of cultural competence, empathy, and ability to create meaningful relationships. This portion of the recruitment phase would not require additional human resources, given that the NWSP has professional employees who have been delivering the program since its inception in 2012. Therefore, these organizational supports can collaborate on effective applicant selection.

Training should focus on: (1) formally orienting staff to the wraparound approach and helping them implement the theory into practice in accordance with the immigration and settlement sector; (2) educating staff on the delivery of a strengths-based approach; (3) encouraging staff to build and maintain community connections for successful client outcomes; (4) providing cultural proficiency and diversity training; and (5) interview and assessment skills training (Jonquil Eyre Consulting, 2009, p. 83). There are various methods VIRCS could employ to achieve this portion of the recruitment phase. For example, Wrap Canada is a national association that broadly supports the training and use of the wraparound process across Canada (Wrap Canada, 2013). WRAP Canada has developed a Canadian Model of High Fidelity Wraparound, which is a five-day wraparound facilitator training and certification (Systems Improvements through Service Collaboratives [SISC], n. d., p. 4). There are ten three-hour modules with a variety of exercises to choose from, depending on the needs of those being trained and the target population. Wrap Canada also developed follow-up training that consists of two three-hour modules to be delivered six to 12 months after case managers have completed initial training. Two levels of certification are available: (1) certified wraparound facilitator and (2) certified high fidelity wraparound facilitator (SISC, n. d., p. 4). Furthermore, the Canadian Wraparound Institute offers certified training, coaching, and help to develop and valuate programs, costing approximately $1500/day, not including travel and expenses, to have on-site training, coaching, and technical assistance before, during, and after the program is implemented (SISC, n. d., p. 4).

VIRCS could engage Mark Vander Vennen at markvv@shalemnetwork.org from Wrap Canada for training information and materials. To fund the training, VIRCS could approach LIFT, which is a national non-profit organization that believes vulnerable and at-risk Canadians deserve access to tools and opportunities they need to thrive in society. As previously noted, LIFT announced a unique initiative in 2018 to help Canadian settlement organizations expand their capacity and reach to deliver real change in the lives of newcomers (LIFT, 2018, para. 2). LIFT has received funding from IRCC to implement this initiative and may be able to help VIRCS fund formal training sessions to improve the quality of wraparound services through the NWSP. In addition, interview findings have revealed that various organizations throughout the community offer online wraparound training. As per the recommendation of Participant G313, VIRCS could make these online
trainings mandatory for staff, so that staff could each receive the same level of knowledge and be compensated for their time to engage in the training.

Supervision and coaching could occur through job shadowing. For example, after a one week training and orientation program, newly hired case managers could work in collaboration with an experienced case manager for approximately two-weeks to one month with a view toward translating their wraparound knowledge into practice. In turn, experienced case managers could offload several of their clients to the new hire once they are ready to work on their own, thereby relieving workload for individual staff, which could result in improved job satisfaction. Finally, performance management could occur through quarterly reviews, which would require employees to maintain a record of their progress and allow for effective performance assessments against the expectations outlined in training and orientation.

**Staff Retention**

Two ways VIRCS could improve staff retention is through hiring an onsite counsellor and engaging in team building. As noted in the interviews, the nature of the work that case managers perform can be emotionally taxing. In addition, case managers tend to become attached to their clients and often worry about their wellbeing, which could lead to increased levels of anxiety. These stressors become exacerbated when case managers are dealing with an individual or family who face multiple barriers to immigration and settlement. Currently, staff have access to external counselling through their insurance policy. An external service generally comprises of face-to-face counselling, a telephone helpline, legal advice, and critical-incident debriefing, whereas workplace counselling can be defined as the provision of brief psychological therapy for employees of an organization, which is paid for by the employer (Mintz, 2014, para. 2).

External counselling requires employees to make an appointment and incorporate it into their schedule. Group 3 interview participants noted that they often do not have time to engage in offsite counselling, given that many of them have multiple jobs. According to Mintz (2014), “Workplace counselling offers the employer a service that is valued by employees, has the potential for savings by reducing sickness absence, takes pressure off managers through the availability of a constructive means of dealing with ‘difficult’ staff or situations, and contributes to its reputation as a caring employer,” (para. 5). Additional benefits to the employee include: easy access to a qualified and supervised practitioner; enhanced decision-making; effective stress coping; and reduced risk of illness (The Family Enhancement Centre, 2015, para. 8). Additional benefits to employers include: valued service by employees; decreased costs related to turnover, burnout, and accident-related disability; and improved employee performance and increased productivity (The Family Enhancement Centre, 2015, para. 9). The average annual salary of a counsellor in Canada is $53,544 (PayScale, 2019). However, the benefits may outweigh these incurred costs. A workplace counsellor could relieve stress among case managers, thereby enhancing their work environment, while providing counselling services to newcomers directly through VIRCS, thereby concurrently addressing some of the noted challenges with limited resources.

Another method to improve employee retention would be to engage in team building activities. Currently, the Settlement Team does not have any team building mechanisms in practice. According to Zia (2011), organizational team building efforts are obligatory to boost employee morale, which will, in turn, increase employee retention (p. 36). While team building is a vast term that has many sub-dimensions, team performance, individual contribution, team coordination, and team evaluation have been found to play a pivotal role in enhancing employee morale and employee retention (Zia, 2011, p. 36). In other words, it is important for employers to share a set of goals among the team and host regular meetings where team members can identify areas that they need support on, receive praise for their accomplishments, streamline workflows to achieve a mutual goal, and have regular debriefing sessions to evaluate team progress. One method to accomplish these sub-dimensions of team building could be to create a communal work-plan containing a work breakdown structure, wherein individual team members are assigned tasks, discuss the steps to achieve those tasks, and collaborate toward achieving a common goal. The Settlement Team could host weekly or biweekly meetings to discuss and update the work-plan, identify tasks that need additional support, and celebrate milestones. These team building activities do not necessarily generate additional costs within an organization, as there are several free work-plan templates that could be downloaded from the internet. In addition to these formal processes, the Settlement Team could also organize monthly team outings. Such
informal activities could help staff relate to each other on a human level and develop meaningful relationships amongst each other, thereby contributing to a positive work environment.

Overall, investing into a recruitment and retention strategy may result in marginally increased costs for VIRCS. Nevertheless, there is sound evidence retrieved from the current study that is supported by the literature indicating that the benefits of an effective employee and recruitment strategy could outweigh the costs due to refined, robust, and comprehensive service delivery in addition to positive team morale and decreased employee turnover. This recommendation would likely be achievable between 2020 and 2022, and continue on an ongoing basis.

**RECOMMENDATION 3: CREATE A DIVERSIFIED FUNDING STREAM FOR THE NWSP (2020-2023)**

Another recommendation to enhance the effectiveness of the NWSP is the establishment of a diversified funding stream to support the hire of various professionals and the implementation of a greater variety of workshops in effort of helping newcomers successfully settle and integrate into Greater Victoria. As noted in the interview findings of this study, the NWSP is in need of additional funding to enhance its capacity and improve outcomes for newcomers. Recall that the NWSP is solely funded through IRCC and operates on a three-month cycle, wherein the Program receives a minimum of $80,000.00 from the federal government, with a budget of $1,750.00 per client (A. Okot-Ochen, personal communication, March 25, 2019). Additional budgeted costs include a $300.00 travel fund to cover the cost of transportation and stay for the Settlement Team when conducting outreach services and a $700.00 employee development fund for training. The implementation of additional staff and a greater variety of workshops would likely supersede this budget. A diversified funding stream could address this issue.

According to Butterworth, Ghiloni, Revell, and Brooks-Lane (n. d.), “Diversified funding involves establishing a flexible funding base that includes multiple sources of funding support and assuring that support dollars can follow and adapt to the employment goals and support needs of each individual and consumer,” (p. 1). Diversification is accomplished through tapping into a full array of funding options that are consistent with the mission, goals, and core services provided by the NWSP. Limiting funding agreements to IRCC restricts the NWSP in terms of the population it can serve and the services it can provide. It also makes the NWSP vulnerable to periodic funding shortages. There are multiple funding opportunities that support the immigration and settlement sector. Some of these opportunities have been summarized in Table 12.

**TABLE 12. FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget 2019: Making Life Better, The Government of B.C.</strong></td>
<td>In <em>Budget 2019: Making Life Better</em> (Budget 2019), the Government of B.C. made several commitments focused on prioritizing talent. A number of these are relevant to the work conducted through the NWSP. The NWSP could collaborate with the Province to receive a proportion of these investments in effort to enhance positive outcomes for newcomers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Budget 2019 invested nearly $18 million that will continue to make adult basic education and English language learning free and accessible for the people who need it (Government of B.C., 2019, p. 34).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In 2018, B.C. invested $2.4 million into community adult literacy programs. This investment is helping adult learners access these programs in 75 communities throughout B.C. (Government of B.C., 2019, p. 34).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- WorkBC centres have been expanded to 103 locations from 84, extending eligibility for specialized WorkBC services, and adding $9 million for enhanced skills training (Government of B.C., 2019, p. 35).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Budget 2019 invested an additional $3 million over three years in the Industry Training Authority (ITA) to increase resources and supports for apprentices and employers. This funding will also support the ITA’s progress toward greater inclusion of Indigenous people, women, and other equity seeking groups in skilled trades (Government of B.C., 2019, p. 35).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Budget 2019 has expanded B.C.’s immigrant settlement services — including improvements to credential recognition programs — in order to help newcomers find</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget 2018 saw the launch of Homes for B.C., government’s 30-point housing plan and the largest investment in housing affordability in B.C.’s history — $7 billion over 10 years. Through this plan, B.C. is building the homes people need and improving security for renters (Government of B.C., 2019, p. 13).

Opportunities for the NWSP include accessing funding from these institutions for:

- ESL classes;
- Helping newcomers go to school or receive recognition for their foreign education documents;
- Helping newcomers find a suitable job; and
- Helping newcomers find suitable housing.

**Resettlement Assistance Program, IRCC, The Government of Canada**

The Government of Canada provides resettlement help to Convention Refugees abroad. These funds are used to help pay for:

- Meeting refugees at the airport or port of entry;
- A temporary place to live;
- Help finding a permanent place to live;
- Basic household items; and
- General help with life in Canada.

Refugees can also use this money for income support for up to one year (Government of Canada, 2018a, *Financial Help-Refugees*).


Opportunities for the NWSP include helping refugees apply for the Resettlement Assistance Program, thereby saving a portion of the $1,750.00 per client and allowing for the reallocation of resources for other settlement and integration purposes.

**Human Rights Program, Canadian Heritage, The Government of Canada**

The mission of the Human Rights Program is to promote the development, understanding, respect for and enjoyment of human rights in Canada. It is primarily concerned with human rights education in the domestic context. Priorities of the Program include children's rights and supporting innovative ways of creating awareness of human rights issues.

The Program undertakes educational and promotional activities involving the public, educators, non-governmental organizations, government departments, and others. This includes providing a selected number of grants and contributions to eligible organizations and distributing human rights publications upon request.

The Human Rights Program provides a limited number of grants and contributions to projects that increase awareness, knowledge, and practical enjoyment of human rights in Canada.

**Contact Information:** For more information, please contact the Human Rights Program at (819) 994-3458 or droits-rights@pch.gc.ca.

**Brampton and Area Community Foundation (BACF)**

BACF is an independent, public, non-profit philanthropic organization. Areas of Interest/Funding Priorities include:

- Children/Early Childhood
- Family/Domestic Violence
- Education and Training

BACF grants support charitable service organizations that help children, victims of domestic violence, the elderly and those in genuine need; and support charitable service organizations that are involved in the arts, the environment, and education.

**Contact Information:** For more information, contact James Boyd, Executive Director at (905) 796-2926 or jboydBACF@aol.com, or visit their website at [www.bramtonareacf.ca](http://www.bramtonareacf.ca).
CWF is Canada’s only national public foundation designed to raise and grant funds to meet the needs of women and girls. The Foundation gives priority to funding work with women and girls who face multiple challenges. Three grants VIRCS could consider include:

- **Ending Violence against Women (Violence Prevention Grants):** CWF supports a wide range of services and programs that help women and their children rebuild their lives after violence, teach youth about healthy relationships, and support children who have witnessed violence.

- **Moving Low Income Women Out of Poverty (Economic Development Grants):** CWF’s goal is to move low-income women out of poverty and help them establish economic independence. CWF empowers low-income women and builds on their strengths by funding self-employment training programs, social purpose enterprises, and women in trades and technology programs in communities across Canada. These programs go beyond business to address other essential aspects of women’s lives, such as building confidence, learning to network, and securing child care.

- **Building Strong, Resilient Girls (Girls’ Fund Grants):** CWF’s goal for girls in Canada is to instill them with the strength and confidence they need to reach their potential as adolescents and adults. Funded programs work with girls aged 9 to 13 to develop leadership, critical thinking, and decision making skills by engaging girls in science and math, sports and physical activities, and media and financial literacy.

**Contact Information:** For more information, please contact CWF at (416) 365-1444 or info@canadianwomen.org, or visit their website at www.canadianwomen.org.

*Source: Adapted from Peel Newcomer Strategy Group, n. d., pp.8-11

To access these funds, VIRCS will need to employ strong grant writing and proposal skills. A method of achieving this for a low cost is providing practicum or co-operative education opportunities to university students with relevant skills. According to Butterworth and colleagues (n. d.), additional steps to consider from an organizational perspective when establishing a diversified funding stream include:

- **Collecting Outcome Data** – Invest in the collection of data about the services offered through the NWSP. The system that is created must include statistical data about outcomes, in addition to satisfaction data from all the stakeholders involved. Find out what the important outcomes are for each of the stakeholders and develop data collection/tracking systems that will generate factual information about successes in those areas (p. 3).

  - Using the Data to Sell the NWSP to New Stakeholders – The system created must be one that is easily configured and updated regularly with accurate information (p. 3).

- **Collecting Process Data** – Know the cost of doing business and become sophisticated in financial planning (p. 3).

  - Using the Data to Evaluate and Improve the NWSP – Develop an internal process for the evaluation of the data. Create a mechanism to adjust aspects of NWSP operation based on the results of the data. Disseminate reports that show results and changes the NWSP is making to strengthen operation (p. 3).

Evidently, each of these steps can be achieved through the implementation of the suggested evaluation framework in Recommendation 1. Recommendation 3 will likely be achievable within 2020 and 2023 and continue on an ongoing basis.

**Suggested Next Steps** – Engage in conducting a jurisdictional scan of available funding sources on a provincial, federal, and global scale, and proceed to network with these organizations to establish diversified funding streams.

**8.3 SUMMARY: FURTHER RESEARCH**

Overall, these recommendations could enhance the effectiveness of the NWSP. A periodic evaluation will generate evidence-based data that could produce justifiable reasons for the continuation of the NWSP and the expansion of resources, in addition to strengthening the reliability and validity of the Program. A retention and
recruitment strategy could enhance the quality of wraparound services provided to newcomers, in addition to creating a healthy work environment for the Settlement Team. Finally, a diversified funding stream could help VIRCS partner with various stakeholders on a local, provincial, and national scale to contribute to B.C. and Canada’s commitment to improve the settlement of newcomers through innovative services. According to the Honourable Ahmed Hussen, Minister of IRCC, “We know that we can do things better, and we are committed to that.” (Government of Canada, 2018b, para. 9). With that said, there is a continued need for research regarding wraparound services in the immigration and settlement sector. The NWSP has proven that wrapping newcomers with adequate and relative services to meet their needs within the community is effective at helping the most vulnerable immigrant populations integrate into Canadian society. Therefore, there is benefit to further studying the research gap that exists in the effectiveness of wraparound services among the settlement sector in order to adhering to Canada’s multicultural values and reaping the benefits of newcomers within Canadian society.
9.0 Concluding Remarks

This study employed an exploratory methodology framework to evaluate the effectiveness of VIRCS’ NWSP. The NWSP is a program administered to vulnerable newcomers in Greater Victoria who face multiple barriers to settlement and integration. The Program is innovative, as it implements the wraparound approach, which is an integrated-service delivery model intended to surround clients with the necessary services within the community to help them succeed. Wraparound was initially implemented in the field of child welfare and youth justice to help youth with serious emotional disturbance. Consequently, evidence of its effectiveness in the field of immigration settlement is limited. There are only a select number of programs across Canada that implement the wraparound approach in the settlement sector. With that said, this study aimed to understand the current state of the Program, examine aspects that are working well, highlight opportunities for improvement, and provide recommendations in light of monetary, temporal, and human resources. Three separate groups were consulted using surveys and interviews: Group 1 – Current NWSP Clients, Group 2 – Former NWSP Clients, and Group 3 – The Settlement Team, who are the professionals administering the NWSP. In total, 40 surveys and 11 interviews were completed. The NWSP was evaluated in accordance with five primary success indicators highlighted in the literature: goal attainment; client resilience; wraparound fidelity; working alliance; and overall client satisfaction.

The findings of this study reveal that the NWSP is effective at successfully integrating newcomers by connecting them to various community resources and inviting their participation in opportunities, such as ESL classes and employment skills training. Newcomers who participated in this study appeared satisfied with the Program and grateful to have received its services. On average, 64.8% of participants stated that the Program has helped them achieve their goals of settling into Canadian society. Areas of improvement were also noted. Specifically, program administrators stated that there are limited community resources, such as housing, child care, and ESL classes preventing them from helping newcomers fully settle into Canada. Heavy workload is also associated with a stressful work environment and high staff turnover rates. In addition, limited funding is preventing support from diverse professionals, such as lawyers and counsellors, from participating in the NWSP. The three recommendations provided – the introduction and implementation of an annual program evaluation; an employee recruitment and retention strategy; and a diversified funding stream – consider these issues in effort to enhance program effectiveness.

The findings of this study also address some of the existing knowledge gaps regarding the effectiveness of the wraparound approach in settlement and integration, as they provide reliable evidence highlighting the benefits that a wraparound approach can have upon vulnerable newcomers. Nevertheless, this project exhibits several limitations that could be explored in future research. First, the sample used to determine effectiveness was not representative of the entire population classified as vulnerable immigrants and refugees. Consequently, the results of this study cannot be generalized to all immigrants and refugees, thereby preventing society from adequately knowing the effectiveness of the NWSP among this population in Greater Victoria. Second, interviews were only conducted with five enrolled clients, without any former clients volunteering to participate in the interview. A greater number and variety of participants would have provided deeper insights regarding the current state of the NWSP. Third, the findings of this study are limited to the NWSP, although there are additional wraparound approaches undertaken across the Canadian immigration and refugee settlement sector. Fourth, this study only evaluated the NWSP’s effectiveness based on tailored measures influenced by the literature. However, there are additional reliable measures to test wraparound effectiveness. Given these limitations, future research is important to better understand the benefits of wraparound among vulnerable immigrants and refugees throughout Canada. It is recommended that Canadian settlement organizations study the effectiveness of this integrated service-delivery model by consulting a representative sample of the broader immigrant and refugee population, comparison groups, expert interviews, and robust evaluation tools.

Ultimately, this research serves an important function in Canadian society. Imagine entirely uprooting your life, leaving your loved ones and community behind, due to persecution, corruption, or simply in the hope of a better future. Imagine aiming for Canada, a free nation with a Charter of Rights and Freedoms that has
committed to welcome people of all backgrounds and create a safe space for difference to exist. Imagine arriving to Canada with personal trauma, only to be faced with language barriers, loss of family and community ties, cultural differences, unacknowledged education achievements, and a perception that you need to change who you are to have a sense of belonging in your new environment. Canada’s current population is 37.1 million. By 2031, approximately 11 million of these individuals will be newcomers (Statistics Canada, 2017b, para. 7). Some members of this population will likely struggle alone, unable to support themselves, while experiencing conflict with the system that has been created to support their integration and settlement into Canadian society. While there have been efforts to address these issues, the Honourable Ahmed Hussen, Minister of IRCC, has publicly acknowledged that, “We could do better.” The implementation of wraparound could be an effective method to improve the experiences of vulnerable newcomers in Canadian society. Overall, the wraparound approach is deserving of future research to incorporate this practice into Canada’s immigration and settlement system and enhance the lives of fellow global citizens who deemed Canada worthy of their new home.
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Appendix A: Overview of the Wraparound Process


OVERVIEW

The wraparound process is an intensive, individualized care planning and management process for children and adolescents with complex mental health and/or other needs. Wraparound is often implemented for young people who are involved in multiple child-serving agencies and whose families would thus benefit from coordination of effort across these systems. Wraparound is also often aimed at young people in a community who, regardless of the system(s) in which they are involved, are at risk of placement in out-of-home or out-of-community settings, or who are transitioning back to the community from such placements. While the wraparound planning process has primarily been used with young people and their families, it has also been used with transition-age youth, adults, older adults in multiple service systems, such as immigration and settlement.

THE TEN PRINCIPLES OF THE WRAPAROUND PROCESS

Wraparound is frequently described in terms of the ten principles or values to which practice must adhere. A summary of the principles is provided below.

1. Family Voice and Choice – Family and client perspectives are intentionally elicited and prioritized during all phases of the wraparound process. Planning is grounded in family members’ perspectives, and the team strives to provide options and choices such that the plan reflects family values and preferences.

2. Team-Based – The wraparound team consists of individuals agreed upon by the family and committed to the family through informal, formal, and community support and service relationships.

3. Natural Supports – The team actively seeks out and encourages the full participation of team members drawn from family members’ networks of interpersonal and community relationships. The wraparound plan reflects activities and interventions that draw on sources of natural support.

4. Collaboration – Team members work cooperatively and share responsibility for developing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating a single wraparound plan. The plan reflects a blending of team members’ perspectives, mandates, and resources. The plan guides and coordinates each team member’s work towards meeting the team’s goals.

5. Community-Based – The wraparound team implements service and support strategies that take place in the most inclusive, most responsive, most accessible, and least restrictive settings possible; and that safely promote client and family integration into home and community life.

6. Culturally Competent – The wraparound process demonstrates respect for and builds on the values, preferences, beliefs, culture, and identity of the client and family, and their community.
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7. Individualized/Client-Centred – To achieve the goals laid out in the wraparound plan, the team develops and implements a customized set of strategies, supports, and services.

8. Strengths-Based – The wraparound process and the wraparound plan identify, build on, and enhance the capabilities, knowledge, skills, and assets of the child and family, their community, and other team members.

9. Unconditional – A wraparound team does not give up on, blame, or reject clients and their families. When faced with challenges or setbacks, the team continues working towards meeting the needs of the client and family and towards achieving the goals in the wraparound plan until the team reaches agreement that a formal wraparound process is no longer necessary.

10. Outcome-Based – The team ties the goals and strategies of the wraparound plan to observable or measurable indicators of success, monitors progress in terms of these indicators, and revises the plan accordingly.

THE FOUR PHASES OF THE WRAPAROUND PROCESS

The wraparound process has four phases: (1) Engagement and team preparation; (2) Initial plan development; (3) Plan implementation; and (4) Transition. Each phase has several core activities. A summary of the activities that take place in the four phases is provided below.

Phase One: Engagement Phase

The engagement phase, lasting from one to two weeks, is characterized by wraparound staff meeting with the family to explain the wraparound process, hear the family’s story, explore the family’s cultural preferences and strengths, and identify informal supports (e.g., people who currently help the youth and family members to thrive). Explaining the wraparound process to families from cultural communities is often easy to do as the wraparound approach reflects a way of caring for clients and families that has been practiced by Indigenous cultures for thousands of years.

Referrals for culture-based wraparound preferably come from families requesting services after hearing about the program from a family member, friend, or cultural leader. When a family is referred by someone they trust, they often approach the program with greater trust than if they are referred by an arm of the criminal justice or social services systems.

Most enrolled families in small communities are extended family members of at least one of the team members or have friends who know team members. Family members often make inquiries regarding wraparound team members in their own cultural community to determine whether these members are people whom they can trust and have the skills to help them. Therefore, it is important that every team member has the respect of the cultural community, and can act as a cultural liaison (i.e., a person who knows and understands the cultural values, supports, and treatments available to community members, as well as the educational, mental health, and social service systems in the larger community).

Family meetings, case management, counselling, parenting education, and social skills training are provided in the languages of the families. This is because a range of potentially adverse dynamics may otherwise occur, which include: (a) information is often lost or distorted in translation; (b) services in English shift power from parents and elders to the English-speaking children (using children to translate creates family dysfunction as it increases the power of the child and often breaks cultural taboos where traditions have focused on deference and respect toward elders); (c) speaking in English for a limited-English speaker requires effort, particularly when speaking about complex and emotionally difficult problems, such as trauma, which is generally encoded and interpreted in a person’s primary language and culture; and, (e) immigrant families feel further isolated and estranged from processes when translation is provided for them rather than for the English-only team members.

Phase Two: Initial Plan Development

In this phase of culture-based wraparound, the family invites relatives, friends, culturally-matched staff (i.e., family partners, family support workers, and clinicians), church members, community members, probation officers, school teachers, and other supportive persons to form a wraparound team
and create a family plan. The wraparound team identifies the youth and family’s strengths, challenges, and values, and the influential people in their lives. Based on this information, the team produces a family vision, develops goals to actualize the vision, and establishes action steps and services to accomplish the goals. When services are needed to reach goals, implementing culture-based wraparound requires that families have the option of culture-based services. If these services are not readily available, they need to be created. Examples of services available in a successful culture-based wraparound program can be found in the services case managers offer:

- Ability to select culturally-matched family partners, facilitators, and clinicians for targeted cultural communities (e.g., Indigenous, Latino American, Hmong American, and African American);
- Mental health, family partner, and youth coordinator services, as well as wraparound facilitation, are available in languages families understand (e.g., English, Mandarin, and Arabic);
- Inclusion of cultural leaders within wraparound teams;
- Cultural-based parenting education groups (e.g., Positive Indian Parenting, Southeast Asian Parent Education, and Effective Black Parenting);
- Multicultural events that honour each culture through cultural performances and community activities;
- Flex funds available for cultural and spiritual activities (e.g., shamans and healing ceremonies);
- Culturally based activities (e.g., weekly Indigenous youth drumming group); and
- Multicultural youth program with youth staff hired from the local cultural communities, where youth staff serve as mentors devising activities that honour the local cultures.

**Phase Three: Plan Implementation**

Phase three comprises the implementation of the family plan (plan of care). Family meetings focus on reviewing accomplishments, assessing whether the plan of care has worked, adjusting action steps for goals not being met, and assigning new tasks to team members (children and families included) to reach the family’s vision.

Generally, when the plan of care is achieved, family vision and goals are strongly associated with the client’s pride in his or her cultural background, appreciation for the contributions of elders, and development of a strong connection between family and culture. For instance, a Latino child who has refused to speak Spanish to his mother shows pride after seeing her lead Latino families and other members in cooking Latino foods. He begins speaking in Spanish and taking pride in his heritage, demonstrating dramatic improvements at school and stopping his gang activity.

**Phase Four: Transitioning**

During this phase, plans are made for a purposeful transition from formal wraparound to a mix of formal and natural supports in the community (and, if appropriate, to services and supports in the adult system). It is important to note that the focus on transition is continual across all phases of the wraparound process in that preparation for transition is apparent even during the initial engagement activities, though it culminates in phase four.

Successful transition requires a plan for the family to cope with stressors that occur after the formal wraparound process is no longer available. Though families have acquired problem-solving skills and learned how to work effectively as a team with their formal and natural supports, their skills have not been put to the test.

Often, the most challenging and difficult task for transitioning families is to sustain formal and natural supports. Culture-based wraparound helps in building and sustaining community supports.

Case manager help families create a community by providing opportunities for families to develop friendships with other families in the program and the community (e.g., culturally-matched parenting groups, culture-specific parent education programs, multicultural youth activities, and multicultural family activities). Youth and families continue to participate in these activities even after successful graduation from wraparound, which helps to maintain cultural connections.
Appendix B: Survey (English Version)

The following questions are about the current status of VIRCS’ Newcomer Wraparound Support Program. For each of the questions below, check the response that is the most applicable to you.

1. Are you currently enrolled in the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program through the Victoria Immigrant and Refugee Centre Society (VIRCS)?
   - Yes
   - No

2. Do you meet at least every month or so with your Case Manager (A Case Manager is the person who meets with you regularly to talk about your progress and help you settle into Greater Victoria) and your Wraparound Team (A Wraparound Team is the group of people who have been brought into the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program to help you settle into Greater Victoria)?
   - Always
   - Usually
   - Sometimes
   - Never

3. Do you have a Wraparound Plan that says who will do what and how it will happen (A Wraparound Plan is a list of actions that explains what you can do to solve any issues or challenges you have as a newcomer and connects you with organizations in Greater Victoria that can help you)?
   - Yes
   - No

4. What are your barriers to settlement and integration? Check all that apply.
   - I can’t speak English well.
   - I’m having a hard time finding a job in my field of expertise.
   - I’m having a hard time finding a job in general.
   - I feel discriminated against.
   - My education isn’t recognized in the workplace.
   - I don’t earn enough money to support myself.
   - I don’t earn enough money to support my family.
   - I don’t have all my legal documents (i.e. form of identification, healthcare card, driver’s license, etc.).
   - I feel like I have to change who I am to fit into Canadian society.
   - I’m not interested in finding a job.
   - I’m not interested in becoming a part of my community.
   - I don’t understand how things work in Canada (i.e. employment, banking, civic engagement, etc.).
   - I had bad experiences in my country of origin that are getting in the way of my settlement and integration (i.e. threats against my safety and wellbeing, persecution, trauma, refugee camps).
   - Other (please specify): ____________________

5. What are your main goals in the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program (i.e. learn English, find a job, build community, etc.)? Please describe in a few sentences.

________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
The following questions are about your experience with the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program. For each of the questions below, circle the response that best characterizes how you feel about the statement.

6. My experience with the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program has been as described below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a) When I began the Program, I met with a Case Manager to talk about my needs. | 1          | 2         | 3                          | 4     | 5             |
b) Some members of my Wraparound Team are people I know, like friends and family. | 1          | 2         | 3                          | 4     | 5             |
c) Sometimes I feel like people on my Wraparound Team don’t understand me. | 1          | 2         | 3                          | 4     | 5             |
d) My Wraparound Team respects my culture, ethnicity, religion, values, etc. | 1          | 2         | 3                          | 4     | 5             |
e) I am happy with my Wraparound Team. | 1          | 2         | 3                          | 4     | 5             |
f) I think that my Wraparound Plan will help me settle into Greater Victoria. | 1          | 2         | 3                          | 4     | 5             |
g) My Wraparound Plan tries to help all members of my family as necessary. | 1          | 2         | 3                          | 4     | 5             |
h) Some things in my Wraparound Plan don’t make sense. | 1          | 2         | 3                          | 4     | 5             |
i) During my Wraparound meetings, I often write down my progress. | 1          | 2         | 3                          | 4     | 5             |
j) The Program connects me to services that are really helpful. | 1          | 2         | 3                          | 4     | 5             |
k) The Program helps solve my problems. | 1          | 2         | 3                          | 4     | 5             |
l) The Program has made me feel welcome and safe in Canada. | 1          | 2         | 3                          | 4     | 5             |
m) I think I will be successful in Canada after I finish the Program. | 1          | 2         | 3                          | 4     | 5             |
n) My Wraparound Team and I talked about what I will do after I finish the Program. | 1          | 2         | 3                          | 4     | 5             |
o) I think the Program could end before my needs have been met. | 1          | 2         | 3                          | 4     | 5             |
The following questions are about your goal achievement regarding the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program. For each of the questions below, circle the response that best characterizes how you feel about the statement.

7. The Newcomer Wraparound Support Program has helped me:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Feel hopeful about my future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Learn the Canadian banking system.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Find a job that can support me and my family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Find housing that is secure and meets my personal/family needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Participate in programs and activities in my neighbourhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Meet new friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Sort out my immigration documents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Organize my medical documents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Practice my culture, religion, values, and beliefs without feeling judged.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Go to school or get my foreign education documents recognized.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions are about your satisfaction with the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program. For each of the questions below, circle the response that best characterizes how you feel about the statement.

8. The following describes your satisfaction with the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) I am satisfied with the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I am satisfied with the progress I have made since starting the Program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Since starting the Program, I began to meet my needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Since starting the Program, I feel like things have improved.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions invite you to discuss any further thoughts. Please answer to the best of your abilities.

9. Do you have any suggestions that could help VIRCS improve the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program? 

10. What is your favourite part about the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program?
The following questions are about your demographic information to let us know who the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program is helping the most and who is in need of changes.

11. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female
   - Non-binary/Third-gender
   - Prefer to self-describe: ____________________
   - Prefer not to say

12. What is your immigration status?
   - Refugee/Protected Person
   - Permanent Resident
   - I don’t know
   - Prefer not to say
   - Other (please specify): ____________________

13. How old are you? ____________________

14. What is your country of origin? ____________________

15. What is your ethnicity?
   - Asian
   - Black/African
   - Caucasian
   - Hispanic/Latinx
   - Middle Eastern
   - Prefer not to say
   - Other (please specify): ____________________

16. What is your marital status?
   - Single
   - Married
   - Divorced
   - Widowed
   - Common Law
   - Other (please specify): ____________________

17. Do you have any children?
   - Yes
   - No

18. What is your level of education?
   - Less than high-school diploma
   - High-school diploma
   - Some college or university
   - University degree
   - Other (please specify): ____________________
Appendix C: Interview Guides

GROUP 1: CURRENT CLIENTS AND GROUP 2: FORMER CLIENTS

Process and Evaluation Questions
1. Tell me about your experience with the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program.
   a. How long have you been in the Program?
   b. What barriers to settlement and integration do you face?
   c. Have these barriers improved since you started the Program?
2. In your opinion, is this Program helping you settle into Canada?
   a. What are your main goals in this Program?
   b. In your opinion, is your Wraparound Plan comprehensive of your hopes and dreams?
   c. Did you play a big role in creating your Wraparound Plan?
3. In your opinion, are your needs effectively met throughout this Program?
   a. How often do you reflect on your progress during Wraparound Meetings?
4. Are you comfortable with your Case Manager and Wraparound Team?
   a. How often do you meet with your Case Manager and Team?
5. What is your favourite part about the Program?
6. Are there any aspects of the Program that you would change?
7. Do you have any recommendations for improvement?
8. Do you have any additional comments?

Demographic Questions
9. How old are you?
10. What is your gender?
11. What is your immigration status?
12. What is your country of origin?
13. What is your ethnicity?
14. What is your marital status?
15. Do you have any children?
16. What is your level of education?

GROUP 3: SETTLEMENT TEAM

1. Tell me about your responsibilities and accountabilities in regard to the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program.
   a. Are you familiar with the 10 principles and 4 phases of the wraparound process? If so, in your opinion, does the Newcomer Wraparound Support Program adhere to these concepts?
   b. Did you receive any formal training in regard to administering this Program?
2. In your opinion, do case managers work effectively with the client and the Wraparound Team?
3. In your opinion, are clients generally satisfied with this Program?
   a. Are clients’ needs effectively addressed through this Program?
4. In your opinion, do clients become dependent on the Program?
   a. Are clients adequately equipped to successfully transition from the Program into society?
5. In your opinion, are there enough resources available to effectively administer this Program?
   a. Is there adequate funding for this Program?
   b. Are you overwhelmed by workload at all in regard to this Program?
6. Overall, how do you feel about this Program?
   a. What aspects of the Program are working well?
   b. Are there any aspects of the Program that need improvement?
   c. Do you have any suggestions for improvement? If so, do you think these suggestions are feasible with the current state of the Program?
7. Do you have any additional comments?
## Appendix D: Descriptive Statistics Derived from Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled in NWSP</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>27.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>2.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Degree</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College or University</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highschool Diploma</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Than Highschool Diploma</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>30.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Common Law</th>
<th>5.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>61.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immigration Status</th>
<th>Temporary Resident</th>
<th>9.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent Resident</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugee/Protected Person</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>25.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Middle Eastern</th>
<th>7.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black/African</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Evaluation Framework for the NWSP

**Inputs**
- Temporal Resources (Approximately 3 months annually)
- Monetary Resources (Approximately $2,500.00 annually)
- Human Resources (Staff, Students, Volunteers, Experts, Stakeholders)
- Sources of Information (Current Findings, iCare, Clients, the Settlement Team)
- Data Collection and Analysis Methods (Surveys, Interviews, Coding Analysis Toolkit, Excel)
- Communication Plan (Funding Proposals, Online Publications)

**Implementation Activities**
- Appropriate evaluation questions are created in accordance with program objectives and performance measures to determine the continued relevance of the NWSP, program results, and cost-effectiveness. The evaluation framework is refined and implemented between October and December.
- Previous evaluation reports, iCare, former and current NWSP clients, the Settlement Team, and other wraparound experts are consulted through surveys and interviews for data collection.
- Data is analyzed using the Coding Analysis Toolkit and Excel.
- Collected and analyzed data is incorporated into the funding proposal and prepared for publication on VIRCS’ website.

**Outputs**
- Number of performance measures determined. Number of evaluation questions implemented. Number of existing documents consulted. Number of surveys administered to current and former clients. Number of participants interviewed. Number of strengths identified. Number of opportunities for improvement identified.
- Number of interviews transcribed and coded. Number of surveys coded and statistically analyzed.
- Number of findings incorporated into the funding proposal & length of online publication.

**Indicators**
- **Goal Attainment**
  At least 64.8% of clients have accomplished their goals through the NWSP.
- **Wraparound Fidelity**
  The wraparound fidelity score is at least 75.3%.
- **Working Alliance**
  At least 69.3% of clients are satisfied with their wraparound team and case manager.
- **Client Resilience**
  Level of resilience among clients is at least 85%.
- **Overall Client Satisfaction**
  At least 82.5% of clients are satisfied with the NWSP.

**IMPACT**
- Short-Medium-Term Outcomes (2021-2023)
- Long-Term Outcomes (2023-Beyond)

**Examples of Outcomes**
- The NWSP offers a greater variety of service providers, including lawyers and counsellors. The NWSP offers a greater variety of workshops, including employment skills training and cooking.
- The NWSP has established a pool of resources at the local, provincial, and national level due to diversified funding.
- The NWSP has professionally trained case managers, who are well compensated. The NWSP offers a healthy working environment for staff. The NWSP receives continuous client referrals from the community and former clients.
- NWSP clients have successfully graduated the Program within one year and no longer face any complex barriers to settlement and integration.