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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Canada Ontario Immigration Agreement (COIA) has resulted in the development of collaborative strategies between the federal and Ontario governments, as well as numerous initiatives and programs to provide settlement and language training services. As a result of the strategies and initiatives, potential service improvements have been identified in a variety of areas, including the need for a comprehensive understanding of the interpretation and translation services for the settlement sector. Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) in partnership with the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration (MCI) contracted and provided direction to PSTG Consulting Inc. to carry out this study of language interpretation and translation services (LITS) in settlement services delivery.

The objective of this study is to review interpretation and translation services related to immigrant settlement services in Ontario, and specifically to:

- Identify the current needs for these services across the sector and province;
- Study the current delivery of interpretation services at “ISAP” agencies;
- Review practices for the delivery of interpretation and translation services in the health, justice and social service sectors, as well as across jurisdictions;
- Review and list external sources of interpretation services that may be accessed by service providing organizations;
- Identify gaps in the current system; and
- Recommend improvements and/or new service delivery models for interpretation and translation services.

The key project activities were guided by an Advisory Committee comprised of representatives with expertise in settlement or interpretation service delivery, and consisted of:

- A literature review and key informant interviews to document the approach used by other sectors, such as legal, health and social services and other jurisdictions, including Australia, the United States, Great Britain, British Columbia and Quebec;
- A survey of settlement service providers in order to describe the current LITS business delivery model;
- Consultation, through focus groups and interviews, with stakeholders within and outside settlement to assess the current LITS model and to develop options for potential improvements; and
- Development of recommendations, including implementation considerations for moving forward.

Overall, the study found interpretation to be an emerging service delivery field, with little documented in the way of practice or research. The sector/jurisdiction review indicated that most jurisdictions (e.g., Australia) that are considered to have a progressive and effective approach to LITS have in place:

- Legislation/policy to guide service delivery;
- Coordinated/centralized service delivery/administration/funding, and
- Standards and guidelines for the training, testing and on-going performance management of interpreters.
In comparison, LITS in Ontario can be described as lacking in all these areas:

- Neither legislation nor policy have been developed to guide LITS;
- The service delivery system is fragmented, with decisions and delivery systems differing at the organization, regional and provincial levels;
- There lacks a consistent approach to the training and testing of interpreters across the settlement sector due to the lack of a standard province-wide approach to training, testing and using volunteer, staff and paid interpreters.

These gaps result in other system wide deficiencies including:

- Access to LITS in rural and urban areas being limited;
- Service providers’ and user’s understanding of the role of interpretation in service delivery being limited, and
- Insufficient information and communication technology to support the effective delivery of LITS.

In order to address these gaps and improve the delivery of LITS in Ontario, the following recommendations are provided.

1. Establish an Interpretation and Translation Unit (ITU), in order to provide focus, direction and targeted resources to:
   a. Establish a Provincial Policy Framework;
   b. Establish Provincial Standards;
   c. Implement a standard or common training and testing program;
   d. Implement a centralized training and testing service delivery model (Ontario Interpreter Training and Testing Services (OITTS));
   e. Implement a coordinated interpreter service delivery mechanism (Ontario Interpretation Services (OIS)); and
   f. Develop operational guidelines for the delivery of interpretation for the settlement sector.
2. Enhance the technology supports available at the local level.
3. Develop a translation clearinghouse to routinely identify, translate and make widely accessible key documents required by newcomers.
4. Develop service level agreements with providers from other sectors requiring interpreter services.
5. Develop and implement a performance management system, including development of a common reporting system for collecting and reporting basic data.
6. Pilot a “system navigator” role to address the interpretation needs of new and emerging high risk refugee communities.
7. Develop and implement an interpretation awareness raising and education initiative.

The settlement sector was highly engaged and interested in the outcomes of this study. Therefore, this report strongly suggests that a LITS Transition Team comprised of members from CIC, MCI, OCASI, agencies and newcomers be established to determine the path for implementation and ensure that the recommendations are implemented in as timely a fashion as possible. The report also provides a high level implementation strategy with estimated timelines and key milestones. This approach allows CIC/MCI and the sector to gain momentum with high-priority/urgent quick wins and systematically begin the implementation of other recommendations.
## Glossary Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COIA</td>
<td>Canada Ontario Immigration Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Ontario Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI</td>
<td>Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSP</td>
<td>Newcomer Settlement Program of the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITS</td>
<td>Language Interpretation and Translation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAP</td>
<td>Federal program which provides funds to agencies to deliver services to immigrants. These services include reception, orientation, translation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interpretation, referral to community resources, para-professional counseling, general information and employment related services; they touch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on newcomers’ basic needs such as health care, transportation, education, housing and employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITU</td>
<td>Interpretation and Translation Unit – a component of the future business model proposed by this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OITTS</td>
<td>Ontario Interpreter Training and Testing Services – a component of the future business model proposed by this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIS</td>
<td>Language Interpreter Services – a program administered by MCI to provide interpretation services to the agencies delivering services to women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiencing violence in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILSAT</td>
<td>Interpreter Language and Skills Assessment Tool - is designed to test an individual’s skills in English and another language, as well as the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ability to perform competently, at an introductory level, consecutive interpretation and sight translation. It is recognized by MCI as a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>requirement for qualified interpreters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CILISAT</td>
<td>Cultural Interpreter Language and Interpreter Skills Assessment Tool - is designed to test an individual’s skills in English and another language,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as well as the ability to perform competently, at an introductory level, consecutive interpretation and sight translation. It is recognized by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCI as a requirement for qualified interpreters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCASI</td>
<td>The Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants – an umbrella organization representing the provinces settlement sector, with a membership of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approximately 200 members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>Resettlement Assistance Program - a federal program that provides income support and immediate essential services to eligible refugees and humanitarian cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>The HOST program funds the recruitment, training, matching, coordination and monitoring of volunteers (individuals or groups) who help newcomers adapt, settle and integrate into Canadian life. It is aimed at creating “matches” between Canadians and newcomers to provide mutual benefits to both. The Canadian volunteers have an opportunity to learn about other cultures while they assist the newcomers in integrating into Canadian society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Navigator</td>
<td>Recommendation # 6 proposes piloting testing a “system navigator” role. This role is intended to provide services to newly arrived, high need refugees where there are limited community members established in the province to support the settlement of the newly arrived group. The system navigator functions as both a “lay” interpreter and settlement worker. The role recognizes that within these communities, community leaders often play the system navigator role, often without appropriate training about the roles and responsibilities of an interpreter (i.e.: boundaries, confidentiality, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWIS</td>
<td>Settlement Workers in the Schools, a component of ISAP in which settlement workers are placed in schools and refer newcomer families with children in the school to resources in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Interpreter</td>
<td>See system navigator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARS</td>
<td>Government Assisted Refugees - three classes of refugees can seek resettlement in Canada: (1) Convention refugees who are outside their country of origin and fear persecution due to race, religion, political opinion, nationality or membership in a particular group; (2) refugees who are outside their country of origin and seriously affected by civil war, armed conflict or massive violation of human rights; and (3) refugees who meet the definition of Convention refugee but are still in their country of citizenship or residency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAG</td>
<td>Ontario Ministry of the Attorney General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

The Canada Ontario Immigration Agreement (COIA) outlines federal and provincial roles and responsibilities in immigration and integration. The primary objectives and areas of activity for the agreement are to improve outcomes for newcomers, to increase economic benefits of immigration and to engage municipalities in immigration and integration activities related to their interests. As part of the agreement there was a plan for $920 million of federal funding over five years (2006 to 2010) for settlement and language training services for newcomers to Ontario.

COIA has resulted in the development of collaborative strategies of the federal and provincial governments, and numerous initiatives and programs to provide settlement and language training services. As the COIA has progressed, various needs have been identified in a variety of areas, including need for a comprehensive understanding of the interpretation and translation services for the settlement sector, along with identification of improvement opportunities.

The settlement sector generally regards the delivery of interpretation and translation services as fragmented and inadequate. Traditionally, and as is still the case, interpretation services have been provided for the most part by settlement agency staff and volunteers who had some knowledge of the language of the newcomer. The newcomer’s family members from time to time fulfill the interpreter role as well. There is a wide range of interpreter standards available ranging from those required to represent an individual at legal proceedings, to the casual explanation of every day situations.

The objective of this study is to review language interpretation and translation services (LITS) related to immigrant settlement services in Ontario, and specifically to:

- Identify the current needs for these services across the sector and province;
- Study the current delivery of interpreter services at ISAP agencies;
- Review the interpretation and translation service models used in the health, justice and social service sectors as well as across jurisdictions;
- Review and list external sources of interpreter services that may be accessed by service providing organizations;
- Identify gaps in the current system; and
- Recommend improvements and/or new service delivery models for interpretation and translation services.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Ontario Region (CIC) and the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration (MCI) identified interpretation services as the primary focus for the study, more so than translation services. They contracted PSTG Consulting Inc. to perform the study, providing research, consultation and analysis as well as the development and presentation of recommendations for improvements.
2. Study Approach

The approach to this study consisted of:

- Acquiring background documentation, context, and project direction from the Project Leads and the Project Advisory Committee;
- Reviewing the approach, activities and possible lessons learned from LITS in other jurisdictions and sectors (e.g.: health, education, legal);
- Assessing the current business delivery model – including services, stakeholders, operations, needs, gaps, etc.;
- Consulting with stakeholders – through a survey, interviews and focus groups;
- Developing options for potential improvements; and
- Developing and presenting recommendations, along with implementation considerations.

Many of these activities were performed in parallel in order to be efficient with people’s time, and to be able to go back to people and test ideas and options while still collecting data or reviewing jurisdictions.

The development of the business delivery model provides an overall view of how LITS are delivered in Ontario, particularly for the settlement sector. A draft model was produced by synthesizing findings from the literature review, survey and interviews. This was used as a tool for guiding some focus group discussions, and was further refined as focus groups were completed.

In addition we researched how LITS are provided in jurisdictions/sectors regarded as progressive in the delivery of language services. We identified the approaches and models being used, and where available, the lessons learned by these jurisdictions/sectors. Further information on, and findings from the jurisdictions and sectors reviewed can be found in Section 4.

Throughout the study there was frequent interaction with the CIC and MCI project leads, and the Project Advisory Committee. This allowed the PSTG project team to present and validate findings and test ideas throughout the project, and where appropriate, go back to the sector or other sectors and delve into more detail or get more information.

The Project Advisory Committee was made up of representatives of the settlement sector, as well as experts in the delivery of interpreter services from across the province. Its role was to provide the project team with information and documents that would be relevant for the LITS project, and to act as a sounding board, providing feedback on the study approach, findings, options, and recommendations.
3. **Jurisdictional/Sectoral Review**

As a first step, the models, practices and processes used to provide interpretation services in other sectors in Ontario and other jurisdictions, both nationally and internationally were studied. A review of the literature was undertaken, utilizing a number of search strategies including:

- A review of scientific journals and articles using keyword bibliographic searches,
- A review of Statistics Canada and CIC data, and
- A review of the grey literature, including general internet searches using keywords.

To validate and enhance our understanding of the information obtained through the literature review, several interviews were conducted with experts in the field of interpretation services. In addition, four focus groups were held with representatives from diverse sectors, including legal, health, social services and education to discuss and refine the options proposed for service improvements in the delivery of LITS in settlement. A full copy of the Jurisdictional/Sectoral Review can be found in Appendix E of this report.

3.1 **Survey**

In order to describe the current service delivery model and understand needs and gaps in the delivery of language interpretation and translation, a survey was developed and distributed to 187 organizations across the province. The survey was designed to investigate the current service delivery environment including standards, operating mechanisms, gaps and priorities for service delivery improvement. The survey was developed using our experience and knowledge of the settlement sector as well as information gleaned from the initial jurisdictional/sectoral review. The survey was reviewed by, and revised based on feedback received from the Advisory Committee, prior to being distributed. The survey was distributed using Survey Monkey to all settlement service providers across the province currently funded by CIC or MCI, using a list of service delivery agencies from the combined CIC Ontario Immigrant Settlement and Adaptation Program (ISAP) mailing list and the Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants (OCASI) membership list.

The survey was well received, with 98, or 52% of organizations initiating the survey and 69, or 37% of organizations completing the survey. Given that the survey was administered in the summer, the response rate indicates a high level of interest about this issue within the sector. Please refer to Appendix A for a copy of the survey.

3.2 **Settlement Sector Consultation – Focus Groups and Interviews**

Focus groups and interviews were conducted with settlement service providers in Toronto, Ottawa, London, and Thunder Bay and at the annual OCASI Professional Development Conference at Geneva Park. In addition there was a focus group held with service users (end clients) in Toronto. In total, approximately 100 provider agencies and 12 service users participated in the sessions across the province.
4. Review of Other Sectors and Jurisdictions

The first step of this study gathered and reviewed information on the models, practices and processes used to provide interpretation and translation services in other sectors in Ontario, and other jurisdictions, both nationally and internationally.

- The sectors reviewed include the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration Language Interpreter Services (LIS) serving the Domestic Violence Sector, Social Services, Legal/Courts, Education, and Health Services.
- The jurisdictions covered include British Columbia, Quebec, Australia, with a focus on Victoria State, the United Kingdom and in the United States, Washington State and Massachusetts.

Information from the literature review and interviews was collected, synthesized and analyzed. Key findings were identified and categorized into themes; they are described below.

4.1 Legislation/Policy

The review indicates that the programs regarded as most proactive and effective in delivering interpretation and translations services are those with a legislative or policy framework in place. Australia is an example of a leading jurisdiction in this respect. In June of 1987 the National Policy on Languages (NPL) was adopted by its Cabinet, and since then Australia has led the industry in the delivery of interpretation and translation services.

There is no comparable national or provincial legislation or policy framework in Canada to provide direction, support or coordination for operating policies or programs for LITS. Consequently the approach to legislation and policy is varied and inconsistent. In Ontario, for example, the Ministry of Attorney General, and the Ministry of Education have developed operating policies that address provision of LITS in their specific responsibility areas. British Columbia and Quebec have policy frameworks to assist in the delivery of LITS in health services. Neither CIC, nationally, nor MCI, provincially, have developed a policy framework to support the delivery of LITS in settlement.

4.2 Administrative Structure

The review indicates that a wide range of administrative models are used to support the delivery of LITS. These range from centralized models, whereby a selected one (or few) organization(s) are mandated to coordinate and provide interpretation services for a sector/region to highly decentralized models, whereby the decisions and delivery of LITS are the responsibility of local, individual delivery organizations. There are numerous examples of models that fit somewhere in between the models describes above.

An example of a more centralized administrative model is the Provincial Language Service in British Columbia, a program that delivers interpretation services to health providers across the province. In this model, each of the local health authorities in the province are responsible for providing services in their geographical region. The program also raises awareness about interpretation services in the province and has created standards and training programs. Since its original establishment in the mid-1990s the program has expanded and continues to expand its services to other social service agencies as well as private sector organizations.
Overall, the review indicates that jurisdictions/sectors that employ a more centralized approach to the administration of LITS are also considered to have more effective and consistent LITS services.

4.3 Training/Testing/Standards

There is a lot of discussion in the literature about interpreter training and testing and service standards, as well as the impact of these on service quality. The research on the impact of interpretation on the quality of service delivery is sparse; however, there are studies, particularly in the health field, that document the relationship between lack of training and medical interpretation errors.

The review indicates that there is not a consistent or standardized approach to training and testing across jurisdictions or sectors. For example, MCI’s LIS requires its interpreters to participate in an 80 hour training program, with a focus on the role of the interpreter and interpretation in the legal context. It also requires its interpreters to pass the ILSAT/CILISAT test. The courts system in Ontario, on the other hand, uses a different training program and does not use the same tests. In Australia, the government requires its interpreters and translators to be accredited through a national body.

Industry experts consider interpreter training and testing, whether interpreters are paid individuals or volunteers, to be essential. Service users have expectations for good service quality and are increasingly demanding accountability when mistakes happen. The benefits of having trained interpreters in place are substantial and were identified in every jurisdiction as critical for success of the settlement/integration objectives. Jurisdictions and sectors that have a standardized approach to training and testing, including tiered levels (e.g., basic, advanced, sector specific) to meet various service needs, are considered industry leaders.

4.4 Public Education/Information

The review found that, jurisdictions/sectors use a variety of approaches to inform and educate newcomers/the public about available services. Progressive jurisdictions are also engaged in educating and raising awareness among service providers in diverse sectors about the need for LITS, with the aim of increasing the use of interpreters in service delivery.

Examples of notable public education initiatives include:

- Victoria, Australia – a Public Interpretation Card that identifies a person’s preferred language of communication and whether or not they speak any other languages;
- Quebec - information for the public, and the steps to take if language assistance is required, is posted on the provincial website;
- British Columbia - the Provincial Language Service actively advertises its service to other sectors in order to grow its business.

In Ontario, it is currently up to individual service provider organizations to promote the availability of interpreter services to their clients or stakeholders. Service provider awareness raising or education is left to the discretion of individual interpretation service providers.
4.5 Funding

The review found that, funding models, like administrative structures, vary from highly centralized to de-centralized, and further, include diverse approaches and mechanisms, such as payment for service, and incentives for individuals to get trained as interpreters. The LIS provides an example of centralized funding model. The LIS is funded by MCI to recruit, roster, train, test and deliver interpreter services to the domestic violence sector as required. Seven regional offices receive the funds to deliver services to domestic violence agencies, which do not receive any funding for interpretation. An American example of a decentralized funding model can be found in Massachusetts, where the state provides funding to hospitals, such as the Boston Medical Centre, as part of their overall budget, and the hospitals manages their interpretation program internally.

The report also found that training and testing are not routinely funded by jurisdictions/sectors. Consequently, organizations use various strategies to cover these costs, often charging individuals looking to be trained as interpreters, contracting with volunteer trainers or absorbing the cost of training through other budget lines. Some jurisdictions (e.g., Australia) believe that funding training increases the interpreter labour pool and provide training grants for individuals looking to become interpreters in the specific languages that they are having difficulty recruiting for.
5. Interpretation and Translation Services Current Business Model

The Language Interpretation and Translation Service Business Model, depicted graphically in Figure 1, outlines how, at a high level, LITS are currently provided in the settlement sector. The model is based on the “Settlement Sector High Level Business Model”, developed by OCASI in 2008. Although it is recognized that numerous sectors interact with newcomers, the focus of the model is the settlement serving sector, and more specifically, ISAP funded agencies, describing the services that they provide and how they interact with other sectors.

The business model is used to establish a common framework for the sector and highlights the business processes and information flows that are common across the sector. It is composed of Suppliers, Inputs, Core Services, Outputs and Consumers. The key stakeholders, services and functions performed across the sector are identified and categorized within these five components. The model presents a conceptually linear flow initiated by the supplier, who provides resources, that in addition to specific inputs, enables the delivery of services by agencies which result in outputs for the consumers. The circular arrows indicate the interface between settlement and other sectors that support newcomers.

A draft model was developed, revised and validated for accuracy during a series of focus group meetings undertaken as part of this study. This also helped in the discussions with the focus groups.

![Figure 1: Current Interpretation and Translation Services Business Model](image)

There are approximately 200 settlement service providers in the province. The majority, approximately 59% or 163 of these are located in the GTA; 31 or 11% are in non-GTA Central Region; 28 or 10% are located in the Southwest; 49 or 18% are in the East and 5 or 2% are in the North.
Settlement services are delivered by a diverse group of agencies. For example, many are small in size, historically providing services to a specific language newcomer group; others are large, multi-service, multicultural organizations. These deliver a broad range of services (e.g., housing, health) to a diverse group of newcomers speaking various languages.

**Suppliers**

Suppliers are stakeholders that provide the resources required to deliver interpretation services. The suppliers for the delivery of LITS have been identified as staff, volunteers, purchased services (paid interpreters), community organizations, friends & family, and funders and donors. Staff, volunteers, paid interpreters, and friends & family are used in delivering the service. Community organizations indirectly supply the service by providing volunteers or fee-for-service interpreters to organizations. Funders (CIC, MCI) directly provide the settlement organizations with funding for staff or dedicated funding for translation or interpretation.

There are approximately 25 organizations providing fee for service interpretation and/or translation services in the province. The list of these organizations is included in Appendix B. Most interpreters providing services in Ontario are on the roster of one or more of these organizations.

**Inputs**

The delivery of interpretation and translation services is provided through a number of inputs, including:

- Service standards – each organization may or may not have operational policies. There are no province wide guidelines or standards;
- Training and testing – there are numerous approaches to training and testing in the province. Some settlement providers will use trained and tested interpreters, other organizations may use untrained staff or community members; and
- Information & evidence – agencies may use or may not use information to plan their interpretation service needs.

**Services that Require Interpretation and Translation**

Although settlement service providers are diverse, the model does capture all the services delivered by the sector and divides these into two areas; CIC ISAP funded services, and other non ISAP services. Internal needs assessment, counselling/case management, orientation, information & referral and assisting services are traditionally ISAP funded services. Many newcomer serving agencies also deliver services to newcomers which historically have been considered outside the scope of settlement, including legal, health, employment & training, shelter & housing, education and social services.

Further, newcomers interact with agencies in other sectors, and require interpretation services to access these services. In the current model, the newcomer does not have consistent access to interpretation as she/he moves within settlement or across sectors. Internally, most settlement agencies use staff or volunteer interpreters to deliver services, and multi-service organizations may provide interpretation to newcomers using some of their programs but not others. Further, settlement organizations struggle to provide interpretation to the clients that they refer to external service providers in other sectors. Often, the settlement agency is expected to accompany the client to the referring agency to provide interpretation. In many of these situations, volunteers, often without the appropriate training or expense coverage, are called upon to fill a service need that staff cannot, due to internal workload pressures.
**Outputs**

The outputs in this model, are settlement services that have been translated and/or interpreted. Although interpretation and translation are services used daily to support the delivery of settlement services, they are not routinely identified as distinct service events, and limited statistical information was available to understand current interpretation or translation service levels, costs, etc.

**Consumers**

Consumers are those that receive the outputs, in the settlement sector these are clients & their families, funders & donors, agencies and the community. Consumers that benefit directly from the service are clients & their families, agencies and the community. Indirectly, funders and donors benefit because without interpretation their programs would not be accessible to some newcomers.

**Process to Manage Interpretation and Translation**

The business model identified three such processes that serve as the foundation for the management and delivery of quality interpretation and translation services in the settlement sector: operational & administration, management & human resources and planning & evaluation. They currently are not standardized across the sector, and with the lack of provincial direction or monitoring, each organization applies different processes and mechanisms. Overall the management processes are fragmented and inconsistent.
6. Settlement Program Need for LITS

Identifying the need for LITS and associated issues in the Ontario settlement sector is a key objective of this study. LITS needs were identified through numerous study activities including: a review of immigrant data from Statistics Canada and CIC, the stakeholder survey, the interviews and focus groups, as well as through discussions held with CIC, MCI and the Project Advisory Committee. This section provides an overview of the magnitude, as well as key language characteristics, of newcomers to Ontario.

As a result of trying to obtain data for this analysis, it was found that there is a need for improved LITS related data from the settlement sector. Direct data on, for example, number of hours spent providing interpretation services, languages used at agencies, etc., is not available. This makes it difficult for CIC and MCI to evaluate current operations and develop future business plans.

6.1 Newcomer Settlement in Ontario – Trends and Needs for LITS

The Canada Ontario Immigration Agreement (COIA) identified the lack of proficiency in English or French as a key barrier that has contributed to the increasing economic disparities facing immigrants to Ontario. Language interpretation and translation services are a strategy for supporting newcomer access to the broadest range of settlement services available in the province.

Ontario’s population is projected to experience a robust growth over the next two decades, mostly with immigration. It is projected to grow by over 30% or nearly 4 million people by 2031. The most recent historical data of newcomer landings in Ontario provides clear basis for the projections, as outlined in Figure 2. There were over 600,000 newcomers in the five years leading up to 2006, at reasonably consistent levels.

![Figure 2: Landings to Ontario between 2002 and 2006 (MCI, 2007)](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Total 2002 – 2006</th>
<th>% of Landings in Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>134,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>141,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>645,000</td>
<td>54 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3 shows the Central area of the province receives the most newcomers, almost 86% of the province’s total newcomers. Figure 4 shows that over the recent five year span nearly a third of newcomers were from India and China. The other two thirds come from a wide variety of countries.
Figure 5: % of Landings by Native Language (MCI, 2007)

![Pie chart showing the breakdown of native languages by percentage of landings.]

Figure 6: Official Language Ability of Newcomers (MCI, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Language Ability</th>
<th>2001 – 2006 Total Landings</th>
<th>% of Landings to Ontario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>57 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>252,000</td>
<td>39 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both French and English</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Landings to Ontario</td>
<td>645,000</td>
<td>100 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2006 Census indicates that 98% of Canadians speak either French or English. The experience among newcomers in Ontario is very different; with only 61% having official language ability.

Out of the 126,000 newcomers settling in Ontario in 2006:
- 50% were economic immigrant class;
- 35% were family class; and
- 15% were refugees.

Newcomers from the family and refugee classes tend to have lower first language literacy rates and more frequently lack proficiency in either official language.

Based upon the information presented above, 39%, or just over 50,000 newcomers per year, report that they do not have the capability to speak in French or English. This indicates a significant demand for interpretation and translation services in Ontario.
Figure 7: Number of CIC Program Users (CIC, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAP</td>
<td>5108</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>5136</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>3178</td>
<td>1083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAP</td>
<td>66309</td>
<td>55155</td>
<td>70191</td>
<td>57828</td>
<td>77800</td>
<td>66114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAP - YOUTH &amp; FAMILY</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>4362</td>
<td>1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAP - JOB SEARCH</td>
<td>5170</td>
<td>5127</td>
<td>5153</td>
<td>5124</td>
<td>4420</td>
<td>4403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOST</td>
<td>3997</td>
<td>2756</td>
<td>4559</td>
<td>3114</td>
<td>3878</td>
<td>2477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>80981</td>
<td>64984</td>
<td>86337</td>
<td>68284</td>
<td>93638</td>
<td>75308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7 shows that almost 10,000 (or 12%) additional new clients per year accessed settlement services in Ontario between 2006 and 2008. Further, we know from the survey administered as part of this study that 93% of settlement service providers use interpretation to deliver services to clients.

Further, based on the experience of other sectors and programs, as well as the increase in numbers accessing settlement services, the need for language interpretation is increasing.

Most agencies (85%) rely primarily upon staff to deliver interpreter services, as indicated in Figure 8. Due to a lack of funding to pay for qualified interpreters, agencies use a combination of staff, volunteers, paid interpreters and client provided interpreters (i.e. family, friends) to deliver interpretations services.

Figure 8: Interpretation Provider Type

Figures 9 and 10 indicate that there is not a consistent approach to training and testing staff or volunteer interpreters or translators within agencies across the settlement sector. Traditionally settlement agencies have relied upon staff to deliver services in the same language as clients. Changes in funding, immigration trends and hiring practices have resulted in increasing use of interpretation within the sector, yet limited capacity for training and testing.
Figure 9: Support Provided by Settlement Organizations by Interpreter Type

Figure 10: Support Provided by Settlement Organizations by Translator
7. Gaps

There are a number of gaps currently existing in the delivery of language interpretation and translation services in the settlement services in Ontario. These gaps were identified in the survey and research, and clarified and validated through the focus groups and interviews. The gaps outlined below have been categorized for clearer presentation but have not been prioritized.

7.1 Access to Interpretation

7.1.1 Outside of the GTA

Most newcomers (82%) are choosing to settle in the GTA. Access to interpretation is more readily available due to the sheer number of newcomers available to provide the service in a wide range of languages. Outside of the GTA and particularly in northern and rural communities, access (through face-to-face or by phone) to interpretation and translation is limited. This can be due to funding, technology, program management, practices, and capacity.

7.1.2 For newcomers from new and emerging language groups

Larger and more established newcomer groups have established the capacity to respond to language needs. Smaller and newer communities do not have access to trained interpreters. When these communities are located outside the GTA, access to interpretation is further limited.

7.1.3 For clients who require external referrals, e.g., education

While settlement programs provide critical services for newcomer settlement and integration, they do not operate independently of other key services that newcomers require. Consequently, newcomers and settlement workers regularly interface with other sectors, such as health, legal, education and social services. From a newcomer’s perspective, seamless and continuous access to service is preferred. In reality, clients do not have easy access to interpretation services as they navigate these different systems, and settlement agencies struggle to provide interpretation for clients they refer. Other sectors do not have a consistent approach to the delivery of interpretation. For example, while some hospitals are committed to providing interpretation services for all client appointments and visits, others are not.

7.1.4 Delivered by trained and tested interpreters

One of the strongest findings to emerge from this study is the lack of access to trained and tested interpreters for the provision of settlement services. As mentioned, most agencies use staff and volunteer interpreters, often untrained to provide interpretation. Agencies unanimously prefer to pay for interpreters that have been trained and tested, but lack the funding to do so. Agencies are concerned with the quality of interpretation provided by untrained and untested
interpreters and potential for errors that could seriously impact the newcomer’s settlement process.

7.1.5. **Demand for service, e.g., timely, volume**

Access to interpretation when the client needs it was identified by the sector as a gap. This could be as a result of inefficient systems for meeting client needs in a timely manner or, a gap between demand and supply. Service providers expressed interest in the use of technology that could quickly connect the provider, client and interpreter, be it by telephone or web conferencing. This appears to be more acceptable and in current use with providers in the north and rural areas.

7.2 **Lack of Funding**

Historically settlement agencies were ethno-specific and staff spoke the same language as the service user. CIC did not typically fund interpretation as part of the operating budget. In recent years a shift is occurring to hire staff for their settlement skills as opposed to language and therefore the need for specific interpretation resources has presented itself.

However, the lack of funding available to use trained and tested interpreters is identified as a gap by settlement agencies to help in making the transition to separate interpreters. While they prefer to hire tested and trained interpreters, they do not have the funds available to them in their operating budgets. Nor do they have sufficient funds to provide training for the staff and volunteers that they rely upon to provide interpretation. Agencies that have been able to recruit trained volunteers lack funding to compensate them for expenses such as travel.

7.3 **Standards**

7.3.1 **Inconsistent training, testing, and performance monitoring for interpreters**

The lack of a consistent approach to training and testing interpreters across the settlement sector was clearly identified as a significant gap in the current settlement service delivery system. Stakeholders suggested that a standardized provincial approach to training, testing and using volunteer, staff and paid interpreters would enhance the quality of settlement services provided to newcomers. They also suggested that a standardized training and testing program could be adapted to meet local needs and could be efficiently administered by organizations recognized as “experts” in interpreter training and testing.

7.3.2 **Lack of sector specific knowledge (legal, health, etc) by interpreters**

The lack of interpreter training and testing becomes a more critical issue given the significant interface between settlement and other sectors. Stakeholders believe that interpreters, although recruited to provide interpretation for settlement agencies, do provide interpretation for clients accessing a broad range of services and there is a need for sector specific training, particularly for clients using health and legal services.
7.4 Lack of professional recognition

The lack of professional recognition for interpretation was identified as a gap which may contribute to the lack of standards governing interpretation services across the province. No single organization is recognized provincially or nationally as empowered to “certify” or “accredit” interpreters. Further, most interpreters are freelance and operate independently, without a professional body to whom they are accountable, which sets professional guidelines regarding code of conduct, quality, professional development, training, testing, etc.

7.5 Lack of provincial legislation, policy or framework

The lack of a provincial framework for the delivery of interpretation was recognized as a gap by the sector. A provincial framework would provide a common vision, set of values and key operating principles for the sector. It could promote standards for training, testing and service delivery. It could include a core program for interpretation and translation services and also promote service quality through ongoing monitoring, evaluation and research of interpretation and translation services.

7.6 Legal liability has not been defined

The settlement sector is increasingly concerned with the legal liability associated with the delivery of interpretation by volunteers, staff or paid interpreters in the absence of a standard approach to training, testing or professionalization. More newcomers understand their right to quality services and several past and current high profile legal cases related to interpretation errors will increase the need for legal liability to be clearly defined.

7.7 Infrastructure

7.7.1 Information technology – limited use of IT for interpretation delivery, and administration

The settlement sector has limited access to or knowledge of the information technology tools available to efficiently deliver interpretation services. For remote, northern and rural communities this is a critical gap. Good teleconferencing and web conferencing equipment could facilitate access to trained interpreters regardless of where they are physically located. This could support improved interpretation services in a more cost effective manner than adding direct one-on-one personal interpreters.

7.7.2 There is limited evaluation of, and research on, the role and impact of interpretation on settlement service delivery

Through the review of the literature, it became apparent that there has been no evaluation of or research on the role and impact of the interpretation and translation on the delivery of settlement services. Numerous research and evaluation questions present themselves:

- What is the impact to interpretation on the quality of settlement services delivered?
• What are the core competencies required to interpret in the settlement sector?
• What percentage of settlement service users require interpretation; for what duration; for what kinds of settlement services?
• How should interpretation service align with and support ESL training programs?

7.7.3 Lack of base data for management and planning

Throughout this study, the lack of easy access to basic settlement data frustrated the information collection process and the ability to develop options or informed decisions. There is not a common provincial reporting system, which enables organizations to easily retrieve their data and produce reports.
8. Options for Improvement

Based on information collected and consolidated through the jurisdictional/sectoral review, the survey and the focus groups, a number of options for the future delivery of interpretation and translation in the settlement sector present themselves.

8.1 Legislation and Policy

8.1.1 Develop a provincial framework to guide the delivery of interpretation services in Ontario. This will help develop, outline, and communicate a vision of what and how LITS will be provided in Ontario in the future. The framework can also include:

- Underlying values and principles;
- Standards for training and testing interpreters;
- Operating standards (when to use volunteers; how to manage external referrals);
- Core policies; and
- Core programs.

8.1.2 Engage in a discussion to identify what services are or are not within the scope of ‘settlement’ in order to develop criteria for access to Citizenship and Immigration (CIC) funded language interpretation services. Given the interplay between settlement and numerous other sectors, this is an important discussion. Key questions include the following.

- Is there a time limit to the settlement period?
- What is the range of services provided and funded by CIC (regardless of location)?
- What are roles and responsibilities of other sectors regarding newcomer service delivery?
- Who is a settlement client (eligibility)?

8.1.3 Engage with other sectors that settlement commonly engages with to clarify responsibility (one, the other, and/or shared) for the delivery of interpretation services. This could include CIC negotiating with other federal/provincial ministries to deliver interpretation services on a fee for service basis, thereby, from a client perspective, ensuring continuity and consistency in service delivery.

8.2 Administration

8.2.1 Develop a centralized approach to the delivery of LIS in Ontario. For example, CIC could partner with Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration (MCI) to extend the Language Interpreter Services (LIS) model to the delivery of settlement services. This program would be mandated to recruit, train, test and match interpreters to meet local needs. This option would require a significant investment of resources as outlined in the table below:
This investment is based on the annual cost per client of $437 (based on LIS program costs), and includes interpretation service delivery costs and administration. Additional funds would be required to pay for training and testing fees assuming that the agency will subsidize these fees in part. Training/testing costs average approximately $1500 per individual. At the same time consideration of a program rollout of this magnitude could present opportunities for significant cost efficiencies. A business case and program design, possibly consisting of a pilot study, would best determine these opportunities.

8.2.2 Alternatively, CIC can fund each individual service provider to recruit, train and test interpreters and to provide interpretation services for clients. This option may not be a feasible long term solution as it; will create competition among local providers to secure interpreters, is duplication of administrative structures, and is not structured for the most efficient utilization and delivery of interpretation resources.

8.2.3 Establish a language access subcommittee for each Local Integration Partnership (LIP) in Ontario to act as a clearinghouse for language access issues. Principles for future interpretation service delivery should be client centered, flexible and responsive to local needs. Local language access committees could be one strategy for promoting a standardized yet locally responsive approach to language access issues.

8.2.4 Review eligibility restrictions (refugees and Canadian citizens). A significant distinction between provincially and federally funded settlement services is the different eligibility criteria. In order to determine the true cost of interpretation and translation services, the eligibility criteria should be clarified and ideally, within organizations, consistent.

8.3 Standards/Training and Testing

8.3.1 Develop a standard/common interpreter training and testing model for the settlement services sector including:
- A single training curriculum that is module based (role, ethics, sector specific, staff, volunteers) and comprised of levels (basic, advanced);
- A single testing program/process.

8.3.2 Centralize/regionalize the delivery of interpretation training and testing (for example, identify regional interpretation service providers who are responsible for recruiting training and testing interpreters). Testing and training are specialized skills and competencies, and there are a number of organizations provincially that have developed
this expertise. Leveraging existing infrastructure may be cost effective and administratively efficient.

8.3.3 Promote the training and testing of settlement staff engaged in the delivery of interpretation services (using a consistent provincial training and testing program, e.g., LIS), as part of the staff professional development program. This may be most appropriate for staff who speak the language of a well established newcomer community, and where up front investment makes sense in the long term.

8.4 Funding

8.4.1 Provide core funding for interpreter services directly to settlement service providers, including Settlement Workers in Schools (SWIS). One option for CIC to consider is including funding for interpretation within the current operating budgets of all its service delivery providers. Each settlement provider would need to submit a request for interpretation funding based on its anticipated needs.

8.4.2 Alternatively, CIC could set up and fund a centralized/regional interpreter services program that would be responsible for meeting the interpretation needs in its mandated region. Although we know how many newcomers used settlement services over the past two years, we do not know how many require interpretation, nor do we know what volume of interpretation is required per client. However, we do know that the LIS costs $437 per client per year. This is a high risk population that probably represents the high end of demand and cost for the service.

8.5 Public Education

8.5.1 Develop and implement a public education program for settlement service providers and allied sectors regarding the role of the interpreter. Even in jurisdictions where there is a strong policy/legislative framework in place to support the delivery of interpreter services, service providers need to be supported to understand the role of the interpreter and to use the interpreter role appropriately.

8.5.2 Develop and implement a public education program for newcomers regarding their access to language interpretation, in various relevant languages.

8.6 Infrastructure

8.6.1 Invest in Information Technology in order to enable more effective and efficient delivery of language interpretation service (for example, call centre, websites, resource and provider lists, common and frequent translated document repository).
8.6.2 Generation of and access to data required for planning (prioritization) and management, e.g., number of clients requiring interpretation, number of hours, what settlement or associated services are used, timelines, cost, etc. This would enable the quantification of the cost of investing in options and subsequent prioritization on an ongoing basis.

8.6.3 Develop a performance measurement system for evaluating the impact of investing resources in language interpretation services. Quantitative data to capture includes: units of service provided per client, # of clients using services, length of service appointment, nature (phone, in-person). Outcome or impact measures should also be developed.

8.6.4 Invest in information technology and appropriate training at service providing agencies to enhance their capacity to deliver interpretation such as teleconferencing or web conferencing equipment.

8.7 Service Delivery

8.7.1 Develop a “peer interpreter” or “system navigator” role and training program for volunteer interpreters in new and emerging/high need communities (i.e., Government Assisted Refugees (GARS)). There is recognition in the sector that a single model or approach to interpretation service delivery does not provide the flexibility required for a sector that needs to quickly mobilize for address the language needs of new and emerging immigrant communities. Recruiting community leaders as volunteers to support the resettlement of peers is one example of a strategy that was suggested for addressing language access issues, particularly for high need refugee groups. Volunteers participate in a short but focused training program that has common yet different features from the standard interpreter training program, particularly in the approach to addressing issues such as boundaries, communication and conflict management.

8.7.2 Set up a “common call number” for service providers across the province to access emergency interpretation services. This would enhance settlement service providers timely to interpretation services.

8.7.3 Develop operational guidelines for the consistent delivery of interpretation in Ontario through:
- Phone/web interpretation;
- Legal liability;
- Lexicon of terms for the settlement sector; and
- Referral procedures.

8.7.4 Identify and translate key documents into diverse languages. This option would also entail ongoing monitoring of the new resources and documents that would need to be translated over time. Translated documents should be made available to newcomers via venues already accessed and used by newcomers.
8.7.5 Building on the previous option, CIC should partner with existing service providers such as a “common call number: settlement.org, and others to make websites more linguistically accessible and therefore the appropriate repository for translated documents and resources.
9. Recommendations

This section outlines the recommendations as developed from the synthesis, assessment and refinement of the options. The recommendations have been detailed in order to provide a clear understanding of what the impact of the proposed changes will be. Each of the recommendation descriptions provides a summary of the challenge that will be addressed, key benefits, implementation and cost considerations, and a high level cost/benefit overview.

The high level cost/benefit overview provided for each recommendation is intended to provide an understanding of cost (capital cost, operational cost, impact) and benefits (service effectiveness, efficiency, impact). Figure 11 outlines the values for the overview.

The recommendations that have been developed from the options have been notionally prioritized with the use of evaluation criteria identified in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Effectiveness of benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Timeliness of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cost to CIC/MCI and/or Settlement Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Support from settlement community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alignment with COIA Strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.1 Guiding Principles

In addition to the evaluation criteria described above, the recommendations strive to reflect the principles that the sector articulated through the consultation process as important to any future LITS business model. These include:

- LITS need to be client-centered and responsive; providing seamless services
- Different service models may be needed in different parts/regions of the province
- Different service models may be needed for different newcomer groups
- Settlement stakeholders should be involved in the development and implementation of LITS improvement initiatives
- Future business models should be open to new technologies and delivery mechanisms
- Future LITS business models need to reflect the interface between settlement and other newcomer serving sectors
- Solutions should promote collaboration between the federal/provincial and municipal levels of government
- Solutions should be cost effective
• Performance management is a critical component of good management for a future LITS business model

9.2 Future LITS Business Model

Figure 12, below, visually presents the future business model for the delivery of LITS in Ontario. It is representative of the recommendations that follow it. It proposes that a body which we refer to as the ITU be established to oversee the planning, delivery and monitoring of LITS in the province. Specifically, the ITU would be responsible for two other entities. The LITS would be governed by a multi-stakeholder group made up of representatives from CIC, MCI and settlement sector representatives.

The first, Ontario Interpreter Services (OIS), would develop, implement and monitor a centralized approach to the delivery of interpretation services across the province. This could include the development of a single roster of trained/tested interpreters that could be accessed by the sector; a single or a group of regional call centres to match rostered interpreters to local requests and a system that utilizes technology (telephony, web conferencing) to deliver interpretation in a timely, efficient manner.

The second, Ontario Interpreter Training and Testing Services (OITTS) is responsible for a centralized approach to the delivery of interpreter training and testing across the province. This could include a single or a group of regional training centres that utilizes technology (web based training) to deliver training and testing in a timely, efficient manner.

Both clients and interpreters would be able to access the LITS system through the UTI managed services or through local settlement service providers.

Figure 12: Future LITS Business Model
Recommendation #1
Establish an Interpretation and Translation Unit (ITU)

Priority: A

Key Challenge
This recommendation addresses the overarching need identified in this study for a consistent and coordinated approach to the planning and delivery of interpreter services across Ontario. An ITU is recommended to centrally plan, implement and monitor interpretation and translation services for Ontario’s settlement sector.

Recommendation Details

Outline:
The ITU would be newly established to plan, implement and monitor the delivery of interpretation and translation services in the province of Ontario. The ITU could be located in CIC, MCI or setup as a separate organization. A separate organization would have a number of benefits over an internal department of one of the governments including; possibly easier to develop and implement, governance that truly incorporates all key stakeholders (e.g., Board of Directors made up of representatives from CIC, MCI, settlement sector, newcomers, and possibly others), easier mechanisms to share the costs, and a good approach to assist with sector support and involvement.

The mandate for the ITU visualized at this time is for it to provide direction, planning and, coordination. It would oversee and possibly provide, where needed, services that are common across the province and most effectively and efficiently provided on a centralized basis, e.g., a central service for requesting an interpreter for an emergency or when not available in a particular community or region.

The interpretation and translation services will continue to be delivered on a local basis. But policy, standards, training, and testing, will be planned and developed by the ITU with involvement of the sector, providing a coordinated and integrated governance and delivery of LITS across the province, communities, languages, and delivery mechanisms.

The ITU is seen as a small unit that makes effective use of the settlement sector resources and community. It will develop the standards, policy, training, testing, etc. through a combination of internal policy, project management, and external resources.

Key Tasks:
- Develop Business Case – including governance, initial mandate, detailed organization and operational design, costing, and rationale.

Primary Impact
The ITU would provide leadership in policy, program management and coordination in the area of LITS for newcomers. The program would be responsible for policy development, the identification of standards, implementing a coordinated and standardized approach to training and testing, service delivery management, monitoring the overall delivery of interpretation services across the province, and monitoring and responding to future trends.
Cost Considerations
*Investment:*
Capital – Low
Unit set up

Operating – Medium
Ongoing staffing and operational budget required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistent policy across the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More effective sharing of information and resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better coordination of program development and service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved performance management system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of consistent standards, training and testing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Considerations:
- The opportunity to implement this unit exists in the context of the COIA, specifically strategies # 1, 3, 4.
- Start-up and operating funding is potentially available through COIA.
- This is a medium term project which would take from 1 – 2 years to implement.
Recommendation # 1a  
Establish a Provincial Policy Framework  

Priority: A

Key Challenge
There is a lack of legislation or policy to support the implementation of service delivery.

Recommendation Details
Outline:
This study identifies the need for a provincial policy framework as a critical success factor for the delivery of progressive language services in the province.

Key Tasks:
- Form a stakeholder committee to oversee the development of the framework.
- Detailed research regarding other specific policy frameworks.
- Consultations with experts and the sector.
- Draft framework.

Primary Impact
A strong legislative and policy framework underpins the interpretation services delivered in most progressive jurisdictions. The development of such a framework for Ontario’s settlement sector would provide the mandate, vision, values and guiding principles upon which language access services would be developed, provided, and evaluated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Considerations</th>
<th>Key Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital – none</td>
<td>• Clearer understanding of planning principles and guides/rules for service development to the sector and those sectors that inter-relate with settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating – Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time cost and the ITU will be responsible for periodically reviewing the Framework for currency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Considerations:
- The sector would be supportive.
- This is a one time cost.
- It could be completed quickly – within 6 months.
Recommendation # 1b  
Establish Provincial Standards  

Priority: A

Key Challenge
The lack of standards leads to inconsistent service delivery, errors, etc.

Recommendation Details
Outine:
This study suggests the need for the development of province wide standards that will provide the sector with a consistent approach to delivering high quality LITS. Standards would address business requirements with respect to interpreter qualifications, processes for evaluating interpretation services, benchmarks regarding timelines of services, etc.

Key Tasks:
- Research and gather existing standards used by other sectors or jurisdictions.
- Consult with key experts in the settlement sector.
- Develop and disseminate a set of standards for the delivery of interpretation services in Ontario.

Primary Impact
The development of standards will support the settlement sector to deliver high quality, consistent and appropriate LITS to clients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Considerations</th>
<th>Key Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital – None</td>
<td>Consistent approach to the delivery of interpretation and translation in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating – Medium</td>
<td>Improved quality interpretation for newcomers; fewer errors and negative impacts on newcomers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time expense with ongoing monitoring to be carried out by the ITU.</td>
<td>Better supports in place for settlement workers to carry out their work with newcomers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Considerations:
- The sector would strongly support this recommendation.
- It can be completed quickly – within 6 months.
Recommendation # 1c
Implement a standard or common training and testing program

Key Challenge
Training or testing of volunteer, staff or paid interpreters across the settlement sector in Ontario is fragmented and inconsistent.

Recommendation Details

Outline:
Developing a common and standardized approach to interpreter training and testing is one of the strongest recommendations being presented in this report and was called upon by all stakeholders consulted within the settlement sector.

Key Tasks:
- Research training and testing standards/programs used in other sectors or jurisdictions.
- Recommend options to the sector and select a standardized training and testing program.

Primary Impact
Implementation of this recommendation would result in clear standards for the training and testing of volunteers, staff and paid interpreters used by the settlement sector. It would promote confidence in interpretation services across the sector.

Cost Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Key Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital – Low</td>
<td>• A consistent approach to interpreter training and testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating – Medium</td>
<td>• Improved quality of interpretation services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would require upfront investment as well as sustaining funds for staff, space, operations</td>
<td>• Confidence in the qualifications of the interpretation service providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could be managed via the ITU or another service provider.</td>
<td>• Improved quality of services for newcomers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Considerations:
- Could be implemented within 6 months to a year.
- Strong support for immediate action on this across the settlement sector.
- Can be co-located with an existing agency, an approach that would be supported within COIA Strategy #1.
- Supports COIA priority # 4 and the focus on system accountability.
Recommendation 1d  
Priority: A

Implement a centralized training and testing service delivery model – Ontario Interpreter Training and Testing Services (OITTS)

Key Challenge
The delivery of interpreter training and testing is ad hoc, fragmented, inefficient and not always accessible (affordable, geographically) to settlement agencies.

Recommendation Details
Outline:
This recommendation proposes that the province (under the future direction of the ITU) develop and implement a centralized approach to the delivery of interpreter training and testing across the province. This could include a single or a group of regional training centres that utilizes technology (web based training) to deliver training and testing in a timely, efficient manner.

Key Tasks:
- Research existing service delivery models.
- Develop and evaluate options.
- Select and implement a service delivery model.

Primary Impact
More efficient delivery of interpreter training and testing in the province

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Considerations</th>
<th>Key Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital – Medium</td>
<td>• Common roster of interpreters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovative approaches (web based training) to training will be available throughout the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational – Medium</td>
<td>• Improved access to interpreter training and testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Set up a physical and electronic location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ongoing staff and operating costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Could be operated by an existing organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Considerations:
- Good support in the sector for implementation.
- Addresses numerous COIA Strategies including #1, #3 and #4 (e.g.: could be co-located with an existing service; promotes accountability; facilitates federal/provincial partnership).
- There are existing programs/models that can be leveraged to implement quickly (LIS).
- Can be implemented within a year.
Recommendation # 1e  
Priority: A  
*Implement a coordinated interpreter service delivery mechanism – Ontario Interpretation Services (OIS)*

**Key Challenge**
The current delivery of interpretation services is fragmented and inefficient.

**Recommendation Details**

**Outline:**
This recommendation proposes that the province (under the direction of the ITU) develop and implement a centralized approach to the delivery of interpretation services across the province. This could include the development of a single roster of trained/tested interpreters that could be accessed by the sector; a single or a group of regional call centres to match rostered interpreters to local requests and a system that utilizes technology (telephony, web conferencing) to deliver interpretation in a timely, efficient manner.

**Key Tasks:**
- Review existing service delivery models (LIS, MAG).
- Develop options, criteria, and select model.
- Implement service delivery model.

**Primary Impact**
The implementation of a centrally administered interpretation service delivery model would support the delivery of efficient interpretation services across the province.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital – Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office space, technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational – Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing operating costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>improved timeliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increased access to the roster of interpreters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved efficiencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Considerations:**
- Good support in the sector for implementation.
- Addresses numerous COIA Strategies including #1, #3, #4 (e.g.: could be co-located with an existing service; promotes accountability; facilitates federal/provincial partnership).
- There are existing programs/models that can be leveraged to implement quickly (LIS).
- Can be implemented within a year.
Recommendation # 1f        Priority: B

Develop operational guidelines for the delivery of interpretation for the settlement sector

Key Challenge
Service providers do not have provincial/common guidelines to support decision making regarding the delivery of interpretation and translation at the local level.

Recommendation Details
Outline:
In addition to broad standards to guide the planning, delivery and monitoring of interpreter services across Ontario, we recommend that the ITU develop a series of operational guidelines that local settlement staff can use for day to day decision making and to inform their practice/service delivery to newcomers. These may be included as a task under Recommendation #1b. The focus of these guidelines or standards, however, is operational and they are intended to help settlement agencies develop internal guidelines for staff to refer to when securing interpretation for clients internally or for referral purposes.

Key Tasks:
- Form a committee to develop the guidelines.
- Identify key operational areas (e.g.: How to Handle External Referrals, When is it Appropriate to Use a Volunteer, Assessing a Client’s Need for Interpretation).
- Disseminate guidelines and support agencies to adapt them for internal use.

Primary Impact
Settlement service providers would be better supported to make informed decisions about the use of interpretation and translation services at the local level. For example, they would have guidelines to support referrals to service providers outside the settlement sector, where clients require interpretation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Considerations</th>
<th>Key Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment:</strong></td>
<td>• Consistent approach to service delivery across the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital - none</td>
<td>• Settlement workers better supported in their work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational – Low</td>
<td>• Improved and consistent communication with other sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One time project with regular reviews carried out by the ITU.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Considerations:
- Consistent with COIA Strategies # 1 and #4 and promotes the development of a coordinated and accountable system.
- Strong support from the settlement sector.
- Could be implemented within a year.
Recommendation # 2  
Enhance the technology supports available at the local level

Priority: A

Key Challenge
Agencies at the local level, particularly those in rural, northern or more remote communities, are unable to access interpretation services that may otherwise be available due to the lack of technology.

Recommendation Details
Outline:
By investing in telephony or web conferencing, access to interpretation can be enhanced throughout Ontario and interpretation services can be delivered in a more timely manner, particularly in rural and northern communities.

Key Tasks:
- Identify requirements (e.g.: telephony plan, online conferencing).
- Testing and Implementation.
- Training providers.

Primary Impact
This recommendation would enhance access to interpretation service delivery methods, particularly in northern, rural and remote communities in the Ontario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital – Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational – Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ongoing technical support for providers - this could be offered through the ITU or through another ISAP agency such as OCASI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Would connect newcomers to interpreters regardless of geographical location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would significantly benefit northern, rural and remote communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotes responsive service delivery model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Considerations:
- Would be strongly supported by the sector.
- Would provide significant support to rural, northern and remote communities.
- Could be implemented within a year.
- Technical support could be co-located with an existing service provider.
- Supports COIA Strategy #1 and facilitates a responsive service delivery approach.
Recommendation # 3

*Develop a Translation Clearinghouse/Program to routinely identify, translate and make accessible key documents required by newcomers.*

**Priority: A**

**Key Challenge**
Many times, the resources required by newcomers are not available in diverse languages. Resources that have been translated are not readily available and there is not a central inventory of translated resources available to settlement workers or newcomers.

**Recommendation Details**

*Outline:*
A Translation Clearinghouse could be run by the OIS. It would collect, inventory and distribute, via existing electronic linkages, translated documents. It would also routinely identify and translate new resources. The Clearinghouse could be managed by the OIS or outsourced to an existing service provider in the sector such as OCASI.

*Key Tasks:*
- Prepare Business Case.
- Initiate project to develop the clearinghouse, assign operational responsibility, assign governance (temporary and long term, if required), identify material, and put into operations.

**Primary Impact**
This recommendation increases the resources available to newcomers to support them with settlement and integration.

**Cost Considerations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Key Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital – Low</td>
<td>Increased resources available to newcomers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational – Medium</td>
<td>Resources more readily accessible to settlement workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Upfront costs to link websites and create multilingual access features.</td>
<td>• Required to support a strong information and referral system for newcomers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Could be operated by the OIS or through another ISAP agency such as OCASI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Considerations**
- Strongly supported by sector.
- Supports COIA Strategy #1 and facilitates a more effective information and referral system for newcomers.
- Could be implemented within 6 months.
- Can be co-located with an existing agency which would be consistent with COIA strategy #1.
- Supports COIA Strategy #3 by enhancing the availability of on-line resources.
Recommendation # 4  
Develop service level agreements with providers from other sectors requiring interpreter services

Key Challenge
A significant challenge facing the settlement sector, given that newcomers interface with almost all human services sectors, is the lack of consensus about when settlement ends and what programs and services the settlement sector is responsible for. Many sectors do not recognize or provide for the interpretation needs of newcomer clients and there is often an expectation that the settlement sector will provide interpretation for clients referred to other sectors.

Recommendation Details
Outline:
The ITU and/or the OIS is well positioned to negotiate interpreter service agreements with those sectors that most interface with settlement. Interpretation would be provided on a fee for service basis according to contracts negotiated. This would facilitate the newcomer’s seamless access to interpretation.

Key Tasks:
- Assess readiness among diverse sectors (employment, health, social services)
- Identify one or two sectors with which to pilot an agreement.
- Implement pilot phase.

Primary Impact
Newcomers would experience seamless service access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Considerations</th>
<th>Key Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital – none</td>
<td>Newcomers would have access to a seamless network of services required to meet needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational – Medium</td>
<td>Newcomer supporting sectors beyond settlement would have enhanced capacity to meet newcomer needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More goodwill and coordination between diverse sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding to pilot the initiative plus ongoing operational funding.</td>
<td>Promotes a coordinated newcomer pathway – client focused model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ITU or OIS could manage this initiative over the long term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Considerations
- Consistent with COIA priority #1 and promotes a coordinated client pathway, and a seamless network of services to support clients.
- Consistent with COIA priority #3 and would facilitate an innovative federal/provincial/municipal partnership.
- Would be strongly supported by settlement staff as well as staff from other sectors.
- The first agreements could be reached within a year.
Recommendation #5
Develop and Implement a Performance Management System

Priority: A

Key Challenge
The sector has limited capacity to measure or monitor interpretation services delivered to newcomers.

Recommendation Details
Outline:
This is a significant recommendation which encompasses the development of a performance management framework, including metrics, to assess the effectiveness of interpretation and translation service delivery in Ontario’s settlement sector. It also includes the development of quality assurance tools, the implementation of a system for learning, and a method for sharing learnings within the sector and more broadly.

Key Tasks:
- Form a performance management committee.
- Develop a performance management framework.
- Identify indicators and information collection processes.
- Develop a learning program that will support the capacity of the sector to collect, report and use information for service improvement.

Primary Impact
The delivery of interpreter services would be well managed and its effectiveness assessed and monitored routinely.

Cost Considerations
Investment:
Capital – High
- Investment in a common solution.
Operational – Medium
- One time up front costs to develop the overall framework.
- Additional costs associated with ongoing performance management which could be performed by the ITU.

Key Benefits
- Increased ability to monitor service results.
- Increased ability to measure/monitor cost effectiveness.
- Continuous opportunity for service improvement.
- Enhanced service accountability.

Implementation Considerations:
- Timely – there is already a project underway to improve data collection and reporting
- Consistent with COIA Strategy #4 and the identified need for increased service accountability and sector capacity building.
**Recommendation # 5a**  
**Develop a Common Reporting System for Collecting and Reporting Basic Data**  

**Priority: A**

**Key Challenge**  
It is extremely challenging to collect information/data regarding settlement sector activities, including the delivery of interpreter services.

**Recommendation Details**  
**Outline:**  
This recommendation suggests that Ontario needs a common system for collecting and reporting basic service level data including # of clients using interpreters; # of interpreter hours used; #of unfilled interpreter requests, all of which would be cross tabulated by language and region.

**Key Tasks:**  
- Bring this recommendation to the attention of OCASI – currently leading the development of a common case management and reporting system for Ontario.

**Primary Impact**  
This recommendation would result in improved planning, monitoring, evaluation and management of interpretation services.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cost Considerations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Key Benefits</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment:</strong></td>
<td>• Ontario’s settlement services would all be connected to a common information management system – opportunity for coordinated planning and service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital – High</td>
<td>• Improved mechanisms for funding and monitoring settlement programs and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investment in a common solution.</td>
<td>• Enhanced planning and evaluation ability at the local and province wide levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational – Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ongoing administration of the system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Could be housed by another provider such as OCASI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Considerations:**  
- Supports COIA Strategy #1 and would facilitate coordinated service pathways.  
- Supports COIA Strategy #4 and would lead to an information management system that supports the effective administration of funding.  
- A project to deliver this recommendation could be completed in six months.
Recommendation #6  
Priority: A

_Pilot a “system navigator” role to address the interpretation needs of new and emerging high risk Refugee communities_

**Key Challenge**
For new and emerging communities (particularly GARS), it is challenging to recruit, train and test interpreters in a timely manner. Further, the interpreter role in these communities is not consistent with the roles and responsibilities typically ascribed to the interpreter. The interpreter in these communities is often a highly regarded community leader and is a trusted intermediary for the population. Accepted notions of boundaries, impartiality and objectivity are challenged.

**Recommendation Details**

*Outline:*
Innovative and responsive models are needed to meet needs in high need communities. This recommendation proposes pilot testing a “system navigator” role, which combines the functions of the interpreter with those of the peer support worker. It also builds local capacity and leadership within newcomer communities.

**Key Tasks:**
- Review and document examples of similar programs already operating in the sector.
- Develop, implement and evaluate pilot project.
- Develop a plan for the ongoing administration of the program (i.e. local agencies receive funds to recruit and support System Navigators at the local level; training and testing is regionally administered).

**Primary Impact**
This initiative will contribute to the development of a more flexible, responsive and client centred system of settlement services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Considerations</th>
<th>Key Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment:</strong></td>
<td>• Supports effective client information and referral services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital – none</td>
<td>• Addressing needs in emerging communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational – Low</td>
<td>• Visible entry point to services – the community leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development and implementation of the model.</td>
<td>• Builds newcomer capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ongoing program funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Considerations:**
- Supports COIA strategy #1 and builds an innovative flexible service delivery model.
- Meets needs of a high risk newcomer group.
- Could be piloted within 6 months.
**Recommendation # 7**  
*Develop and Implement an Awareness Raising and Education Initiative*

**Priority: B**

**Key Challenge**
Many staff within and external to the settlement sector do not understand the role of the interpreter and therefore do not utilize interpreters effectively to meet client needs. Staff may not understand the professional role of the interpreter; the impact of interpretation on service delivery; legal liability issues, how to access interpreters or how to work with them.

At the same time service users/clients are often not aware of available interpretation services and may not understand the role of the interpreter in relation to their settlement worker.

**Recommendation Details**

*Outline:*
Develop and implement an education/awareness raising program for:
- service providers in the settlement sector
- service providers working in sectors that interface with settlement or that serve newcomers
- newcomers

*Tasks:*
- Develop training materials for use with service providers – workshop materials/curriculum for facilitators as well as resources for providers.
- Pilot test training sessions and evaluate.
- Develop a plan to make training available on a regular basis (for new staff or as new information emerges to be shared with service providers).
- Develop an awareness raising plan and key messages for use with newcomers.
- Develop and translate materials (print, electronic) for use with newcomers.

**Primary Impact**
The implementation of this recommendation will enhance the profile of interpretation services and improve the understanding about the role of the interpreter, among both clients and service providers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cost Considerations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Key Benefits</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment:</strong></td>
<td>Service provider awareness, knowledge and skills are enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital – none</td>
<td>Improved service delivery interpretation is used properly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational – Medium</td>
<td>Newcomers are more aware and knowledge about access to interpretation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Upfront costs are significant – development of materials; promotion, translation. Could be managed by OITTTS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation Considerations:**
- Supports COIA Strategy # 1 and facilitates improved access to services.
- Can be implemented in 1 – 2 years.
- Medium priority – supported by the settlement sector.
- Supports COIA Strategy # 3 and promotes improved linkages between sectors.
- Requires coordination with service delivery recommendations.
10. Implementation Strategy

10.1 Getting Started

CIC, MCI, the Project Advisory Committee and stakeholders across the settlement sector in Ontario have been highly involved in the study and development of the options / recommendations put forward. People involved in this work have placed confidence in this project and its process, and are eagerly awaiting the findings in this report. They have voiced their expectations that based on their input real changes will be made to improve the way interpretation and translation is delivered for newcomers. It is therefore essential that CIC/MCI begin to implement key recommendations as quickly as possible.

The first step will be to set up a LITS Transition Team comprised of members from the CIC, MCI, OCASI, agencies, and newcomers. This Team will be tasked with determining the path for implementation and ensuring that the recommendations are implemented in as timely a fashion as possible. This team will also be responsible for ensuring that the recommendations are implemented in alignment with other settlement initiatives and directions. It will also take into consideration that a number of the recommendations can be linked or coordinated with other recommendations.

An Implementation Plan at a high level should also include a Communications Plan and a Stakeholder Engagement Plan. These are critical to the successful implementation of these recommendations. Responsibility for effective and timely (on a regular basis) communications will need to be clearly assigned to the appropriate CIC / MCI project/program lead(s).

In summary, the recommendations of this report consist of:

1. Establish an Interpretation and Translation Unit (ITU)
   a. Establish a Provincial Policy Framework
   b. Establish Provincial Standards
   c. Implement a standard or common training and testing program
   d. Implement a centralized training and testing service delivery model (Ontario Interpreter Training and Testing Services (OITTS))
   e. Implement a coordinated interpreter service delivery mechanism (Ontario Interpretation Services (OIS))
   f. Develop operational guidelines for the delivery of interpretation for the settlement sector
2. Enhance the technology supports available at the local level
3. Develop a Translation Clearinghouse to routinely identify, translate and make accessible key documents required by newcomers.
4. Develop service level agreements with providers from other sectors requiring interpreter services
5. Develop and Implement a Performance Management System
   a. Develop a Common Reporting System for Collecting and Reporting Basic Data
6. Pilot a “system navigator” role to address the interpretation needs of new and emerging high risk refugee communities
7. Develop and implement an Interpretation Awareness Raising and Education Initiative
10.2 Implementation Plan – Critical Success Factors

10.2.1 A Phased Approach

Not all recommendations can be implemented at one time. If CIC and/or MCI and the sector take on too many projects at one time, the result will be that few of the projects will get completed on target or with the quality desired.

Consequently this report suggests a phased approach that allows CIC, MCI and the sector to prioritize recommendations and to initiate a few projects and actions that can deliver some benefits in a relatively short term, and at the same time planning and initiating projects to tackle the more resource and time intensive recommendations.

10.2.2 Involvement of the Settlement Sector

To ensure quality, comprehensive design and implementation of standards, training, systems, mechanisms, etc. envisioned from this report, representation and true involvement of the sector and other key stakeholders is required. Just by having the sector involved in this study set an expectation that actions will be taken and that they will receive communications, consulted, and involved.

10.2.3 Project Performance Metrics

Each of the recommendations will require a project to develop and implement the policy, models, tools, organization, services, etc. In order for CIC/MCI to ensure that their objectives are clear and being met, performance metrics need to be developed and integrated into the initiatives. This will assist all stakeholders to be clear about what is to be achieved, how it will be achieved, and measure if they have been successful.

10.2.4 Effective Project Management

With the number of recommendations, resulting actions, variety of stakeholders, and types of issues, success will require effective project and program management. This will be critical to ensure the objectives are well defined and understood, and that the scope, resources, tasks, timing and risks are effectively and efficiently managed. A key outcome of good project management is effective reporting and communications to senior management and key stakeholders.
10.3 Implementation Plan – A Phased Approach

Successful implementation of recommendations requires a phased approach that recognizes the reality of availability of resources, budgets, and key stakeholders. Based on the cost-benefit evaluation criteria already identified (capital costs, operating costs, impact to the sector and clients, and higher service levels), a high-level Implementation Strategy with estimated timelines and key milestones has been developed. This approach allows CIC/MCI and the sector to gain momentum with high-priority/urgent Quick Wins and then systematically begin the implementation of other recommendations.

**Figure 3**

LITS Implementation Strategy

- **Phase One: Quick Wins**
  - This phase is designed to build momentum for change by focusing on high-benefit, low-cost ‘quick wins’ that can be undertaken within six months. Projects in this phase should not require minimal capital costs (capital costs that may have already been approved) and require minimal other resources.

- **Phase Two: Moving Forward**
  - This phase typically includes implementation of high-benefit, moderate cost projects that will enable significant improvements to be realized. The majority of projects should be implemented during this phase in order to achieve maximum results.

- **Phase Three: Future State**
  - Typically, this phase focuses on implementing Recommendations that have a more significant cost component. Initiatives undertaken in this phase are often more complex, require some capital spending and demand significant project management expertise.
## 10.3.1 Phase One  Timeline: April 1, 2009 to September 30, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project / Recommendation</th>
<th>Impacted</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish ITU</td>
<td>All other projects will be impacted by the establishment of the ITU. The ITU will provide leadership in policy, program management and coordination of service delivery.</td>
<td>The initial phase of establishing the ITU will need to complete in Phase 1 to minimize impact on other projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Establish Policy Framework</td>
<td>Indirectly all other projects will be impacted by the establishment of the Policy Framework. The delivery of projects 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e and 1f will be directly impacted.</td>
<td>Policy framework activities can be completed in parallel with establishing ITU activities. The policy framework is feasible to be implemented within Phase 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Establish LITS Standards</td>
<td>Indirectly all other projects are impacted by the establishment of LITS standards. It will directly impact the delivery of projects 1c, 1d, 1e, and 1f.</td>
<td>The development of the LITS standards can be initiated after a draft/preliminary policy framework is established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Implement Standard Training Program</td>
<td>The implementation of a standard training program will set the framework for a centralized training and testing service delivery model (OITTS) (1d).</td>
<td>Initiate LITS standard training program activities when LITS standards (1b) are established. This work will continue well into Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Implement Training Service Delivery Method</td>
<td>Direct impact on interpreter service delivery mechanism – Ontario Interpretation Services (OIS) (1e).</td>
<td>Initial activities for the implementation of the centralized training and testing service model can occur in parallel to developing the training program standards (1c). This work will continue well into Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>“Common call number” – Implement a Coordinated LITS</td>
<td>The establishment of a “common call number” is a feasible activity and a quick win for the establishment of OIS. It will impact all other projects by showing service delivery progress.</td>
<td>Implementing a “common call number” at the end of Phase 1 will pilot the policies (1a) and standards (1b) developed in Phase 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IT Support to Sector</td>
<td>Direct impact on OIS (1c) and OITTS (1d) delivery mechanisms.</td>
<td>Independent activity that can occur parallel to establishing the ITU (1) and policy (1a) and standards (1b) development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Develop Translation Clearinghouse</td>
<td>Direct impact on OIS delivery mechanism (1e) and LITS awareness (7).</td>
<td>The establishment of the translation clearinghouse is an independent activity that can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project / Recommendation</td>
<td>Impacted</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occur parallel to establishing the ITU (1) and policy (1a) and standards (1b) development. The ongoing maintenance is directly linked to OIS activities (1e).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct impact on the development of a common reporting system (5a), OIS delivery mechanism (1e), and the development of SLAs with other sectors (4).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Initial framework of a performance management system can occur in parallel with policy (1a) and standards activities (1b). This work will continue into Phase 2.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct impact on OIS delivery mechanism (1e), development of SLAs with other sectors (4) and the reporting of performance management (5).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Initiate common reporting project after an initial (draft) performance management framework (5) is established.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10.3.2 Phase Two  **Timeline: June 2009 to March 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project / Recommendation</th>
<th>Impacted</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The implementation of a standard training program will set the framework for a centralized training and testing service delivery model (OITTS) (1d).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Initiate LITS standard training program activities when LITS standards are established (1b).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct impact on interpreter service delivery mechanism – Ontario Interpretation Services (OIS) (1e).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Continue activities for the implementation of the centralized training and testing service model in parallel to developing the training program standards (1c).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All projects will be impacted by the implementation of a coordinated LITS (OIS) delivery mechanism. Its progress will have a direct impact on showing service delivery progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Continue implementation of OIS service delivery mechanism. This work will continue into Phase 3.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct dependency on the development of an OIS delivery mechanism framework (1e).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Initiate development of operational guidelines when a draft OIS delivery mechanism framework is set in place (1e).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project / Recommendation</td>
<td>Impacted</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Develop SLAs with Other Sectors</td>
<td>The development of SLAs with other sectors will have a direct impact on the capacity of the coordinated LITS service delivery mechanism (1e) and LITS awareness (7).</td>
<td>The development of SLAs with other sectors is dependent on the progress of 1d, 1e, 1f, 5 and 5a projects. It's recommended that other sectors are involved in the development of all the other projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Develop a Performance Management Systems</td>
<td>Direct impact on the development of a common reporting system (5a), OIS delivery mechanism (1e), and the development of SLAs with other sectors (4).</td>
<td>Complete the performance management system with the input from the coordinated LITS service delivery mechanism framework (1e).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a Develop Common Reporting</td>
<td>Direct impact on OIS delivery mechanism (1e), development of SLAs with other sectors (4) and the reporting of performance management (5).</td>
<td>Complete the performance management system with the input from the coordinated LITS service delivery mechanism framework (1e).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Implement a System Navigator</td>
<td>Impact on the capacity and flexibility of OIS delivery mechanism (1e), development of SLAs with other sectors (4) and development of LITS awareness (7).</td>
<td>Parallel activity with the implementation of coordinated LITS (1e).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Develop LITS Awareness</td>
<td>Impact on the capacity of OIS delivery mechanism (1e) and development of SLAs with other sectors (4). Dependency on progress of clearinghouse (3) and system navigator (6).</td>
<td>Initiate LITS awareness as coordinated LITS services (1e) are sustainable to support the demand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.3.3 Phase Three  Timeline: June 2009 to March 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project / Recommendation</th>
<th>Impacted</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1e Implement a Coordinated LITS</td>
<td>All projects will be impacted by the implementation of a coordinated LITS (OIS) delivery mechanism. Its progress will have a direct impact on showing service delivery progress.</td>
<td>Complete implementation of OIS service delivery mechanism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1f Develop Operational Guidelines</td>
<td>Direct dependency on the development of an OIS delivery mechanism framework (1e).</td>
<td>Finalize operational guidelines as OIS delivery mechanism framework is set in place (1e).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project / Recommendation</td>
<td>Impacted</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Develop SLAs with Other Sectors</td>
<td>The development of SLAs with other sectors will have a direct impact on the capacity of the coordinated LITS service delivery mechanism (1e) and LITS awareness (7).</td>
<td>The development of SLAs with other sectors is dependent on the progress of 1d, 1e, 1f, 5 and 5a projects. It’s recommended that other sectors are involved in the development of all the other projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Develop LITS Awareness</td>
<td>Impact on the capacity of OIS delivery mechanism (1e) and development of SLAs with other sectors (4). Dependency on progress of clearinghouse (3) and system navigator (6).</td>
<td>Continue with LITS awareness as coordinated LITS services (1e) are sustainable to support the demand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.4 Risk Identification

Risk Management is a good project management practice to employ in the implementation of projects, in particular complex, multi-faceted and multi-phased initiatives. We suggest spending time up-front identifying potential risks and developing mitigating plans. Through the project consultations and our understanding of the current settlement sector environment, the following risks have been identified as having a potential impact on the delivery of the above projects:

- **Funding:**
  - Multiple projects are competing for available funding.
  - The window of opportunity is potentially limited (COIA ends March 31, 2010).
  - Inadequate data available to estimate project costs, making it challenging to build a business case for approval by decision makers.

- **Resources:**
  - Although highly committed to improvements, there is limited capacity within the sector to provide leadership in the development or implementation of the recommendations.
  - Limited availability of knowledgeable/subject matter experts within the sector.

- **Change Management:**
  - Since COIA, the sector has been responding to numerous changes; the sector may be unable, uninterested or unequipped to adopt another change to the way it does business.
  - There are limited change management tools and resources available to the sector.
  - The sector may be discouraged from adopting change if the process, implications or benefits are not presented/communicated clearly.

- **Project Management:**
  - Lack of project management resources and/or expertise available to support the implementation plan.
11. Conclusion

From the study, its findings, analysis and consultation with stakeholders, the study team concluded that:

1. There is significant demand for interpretation and translation services.
2. Delivery of interpretation services across the Ontario settlement sector has significant opportunity for improvement.
3. There are funding and liability challenges.
4. There is tremendous interest and commitment in the sector to assist and support improvements needed.
5. There are options to the steps to move forward, to create a vision for LITS in the settlement sector, and to implement the needed changes one piece at a time.
## Appendix A: Survey of the Settlement Sector

### 1. Introduction

Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC), Ontario Region is undertaking a study of the language interpretation and translation service needs in the delivery of immigrant settlement programs. The study will provide recommendations that support agencies to better deliver interpretation and translation services and better meet client needs. PSTG Consulting has been contracted to carry out this study. As part of the study, this survey is being sent to settlement service providers and the results will help us to better understand how interpretation and translation services are currently delivered. The survey is confidential: detail responses will not be shared with CIC, the results will be shared in aggregate form only.

There are two main sections to this survey, the first focuses on Interpretation Services; the second on Translation Services. Some questions require statistical or numerical data; please provide your best estimate. This survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Please complete the survey by August 15. If you require information or have questions regarding the survey please contact Sylvia Telic at stelic@pstgconsulting.com. This is a critical opportunity for you to inform the recommendations of this study. Thank you very much for your interest and support for this very important project.

**Definitions:**

**Interpretation:** Transposition of the spoken word

**Translation:** Transposition of the written word

**Volunteers:** Individuals who provide interpretation and translation at your organization free of charge.

**Staff:** Individuals employed by the organization and on the organization’s payroll. This would include individuals who are hired to provide occasional interpretation or translation services.

**Professional Interpretation/Translation Services:** Services that provide professional interpreters or translators as requested to your organization for a fee.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. General Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* 1. Organization Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 2. Contact Person:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 3. Size of Organization - # of Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Interpretation

* 1. Does your organization use interpretation to deliver services to clients?  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No

* 2. Who do you use to deliver interpretation? (Check all that apply)  
   - [ ] Volunteers  
   - [ ] Staff (your own)  
   - [ ] Professional interpretation services  
   - [ ] Client provided interpreters (family, friends)

* 3. How many volunteers do you use (on average) to deliver interpretation services?  

* 4. How many staff at your organization deliver interpretation services (on average)?  

5. For organizations using professional interpretation services, please list the names of the service(s) you use and the fee structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of service provider</th>
<th>Fee structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 6. Have you developed standards/policies that guide the interpretation services in your organization?  
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No
7. Please complete the following questions regarding your use of interpreters for the delivery of your settlement services.

| Delivered by volunteer interpreters (Yes/No) |  |
| % of services delivered by volunteers |  |
| Delivered by staff interpreters (Yes/No) |  |
| % of services delivered by staff |  |
| Delivered by professional interpreters (Yes/No) |  |
| % of services delivered by professional interpreters |  |

The following questions refer to organizational practices that support interpretation service delivery.

8. Do you test your interpreters using standards such as CILISAT/ILSAT?

| For volunteer interpreters (Yes/No) |  |
| For staff interpreters (Yes/No) |  |
| By whom (i.e. staff person, consultant, etc.) |  |

9. Do you provide training i.e. the role of the interpreter; sector specific terminology, etc.?

| For volunteer interpreters (Yes/No) |  |
| For staff interpreters (Yes/No) |  |
| By whom (i.e. staff person, consultant, etc.) |  |

10. Do you provide opportunities for ongoing professional development?

| For volunteer interpreters (Yes/No) |  |
| For staff interpreters (Yes/No) |  |
| By whom (i.e. staff person, consultant, etc.) |  |

11. Do you provide supervision, i.e. goal setting, maintaining a professional role?

| For volunteer interpreters (Yes/No) |  |
| For staff interpreters (Yes/No) |  |
| By whom (i.e. staff person, consultant, etc.) |  |
12. Do you carry out performance monitoring i.e. performance feedback surveys completed by clients or staff?

For volunteer interpreters
(Yes/No)

For staff interpreters
(Yes/No)

By whom (i.e. staff person, consultant, etc.)

* 13. What are the 3 key gaps in interpretation service delivery?

* 14. What are 3 priority recommendations for interpretation service improvement?

15. Do you offer interpretation services to other organizations?

☐ No

Yes, to how many organizations?

16. What do you offer through your interpretation services (i.e. interpretation, volunteer training, testing, etc.)?
4. Translation

* 1. Does your organization provide translation services for clients?
   - Yes
   - No

* 2. Who do you use to deliver translation services? (Check all that apply)
   - Volunteers
   - Staff (your own)
   - Professional translation services
   - Client provided translators (family, friends)

* 3. How many volunteers do you use (on average) to deliver translation services?

* 4. How many staff do you use (on average) to deliver translation services?

5. For organizations using professional translation services, please list the names of the service(s) you use and the fee structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of service provider</th>
<th>Fee structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 6. Have you developed standards that guide the translation services in your organization?
   - Yes
   - No

7. What are the 3 main types of documents translated by your organization?

The following questions refer to organizational practices that support translation service delivery.
8. Do you test your translators using standards such as CILISAT/ILSAT?
For volunteer translators
(Yes/No)
For staff translators
(Yes/No)
By whom (ie: staff person, consultant, etc.)

9. Do you provide training i.e. the role of the translator; sector specific terminology, etc.?
For volunteer translators
(Yes/No)
For staff translators
(Yes/No)
By whom (ie: staff person, consultant, etc.)

10. Do you provide opportunities for ongoing professional development?
For volunteer translators
(Yes/No)
For staff translators
(Yes/No)
By whom (ie: staff person, consultant, etc.)

11. Do you provide supervision, i.e. goal setting, maintaining a professional role?
For volunteer translators
(Yes/No)
For staff translators
(Yes/No)
By whom (ie: staff person, consultant, etc.)

12. Do you carry out performance monitoring i.e. performance feedback surveys completed by clients or staff?
For volunteer translators
(Yes/No)
For staff translators
(Yes/No)
By whom (ie: staff person, consultant, etc.)

*13. What are the 3 key gaps in translation service delivery?

*14. What are 3 priority recommendations for translation service improvement?

15. Do you offer interpretation services to other organizations?
  
  ☐ No

  Yes, to how many organizations?
5. Concluding Statement

* 1. We will be organizing focus groups in the fall to further explore Interpretation and Translation needs in the delivery of Settlement programs. Would you like to participate in a focus group?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

Thank you very much for completing this survey!

If you have any questions please contact Sylvia Tello at stello@pstgconsulting.com
Appendix B: Focus Group Attendance

Social Services Focus Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Loonh</td>
<td>Catholic Cross Cultural Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Macias</td>
<td>Culture Link/The 519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meena Chadha</td>
<td>Fred Victor Centre Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Taylor</td>
<td>Fred Victor Centre Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeya Surendran</td>
<td>North York Community House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amparo Escobar</td>
<td>North York Community House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lei Hu</td>
<td>Delta Family Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education Focus Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varsha Naik</td>
<td>Peel District School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Waterman</td>
<td>Peel District School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Cook</td>
<td>Ontario Public School Boards Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Munroe</td>
<td>Toronto District School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Rodford</td>
<td>Simcoe County District School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Clayton</td>
<td>Peel District School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Dorfman</td>
<td>Settlement Workers in Schools Coordinator (SWIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Virgo</td>
<td>York Region District School Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Dunton</td>
<td>DSB of Niagara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Toronto Central Focus Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marco Caupana</td>
<td>OCASI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Chan</td>
<td>University Settlement Recreation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racdah Abdullah</td>
<td>Community Development Council Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresita Perera</td>
<td>Community Development Council Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younglec Ha</td>
<td>Korean Canadian Women’s Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasa Baskovic</td>
<td>Newcomer Women’s Services Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvana Zivkovic</td>
<td>Catholic Community Services of York Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alejandra Cabezas</td>
<td>St. Christopher House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chizuru Nobe</td>
<td>Canadian Center For Victims of Torture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trang Nguyen</td>
<td>Vietnamese Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OCASI Conference Focus Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Najia Sazelya</td>
<td>Afghan Women’s Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palwasha Baqi</td>
<td>Afghan Women's Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Green</td>
<td>Cross Cultural Learner Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Ng</td>
<td>Guelph and District Multicultural Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachelle Pascoe-</td>
<td>Adult Language and Learning (Chatham-Kent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deslauriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliou Sene</td>
<td>Centre de Sante Communications Hamilton/Niagara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamal Farmaly</td>
<td>OCASI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Miry Martinez</td>
<td>Thunder Bay Multicultural Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dina Sousa</td>
<td>Toronto South Asian Women’s Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legal Focus Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latha</td>
<td>Multicultural Community Interpreter Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Angeles</td>
<td>Barbara Shliefer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Cole</td>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Health Focus Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axelle Janczur</td>
<td>Access Alliance Multicultural Health and Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Abraham</td>
<td>University Health Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Rahman</td>
<td>Centre for Addiction and Mental Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ontario West Focus Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna Hendikx</td>
<td>Across Languages – London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lila Basic</td>
<td>Across Languages – Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerman Basic</td>
<td>Across Languages – Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Gichuru</td>
<td>WIL Employment Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haifa Maghnich</td>
<td>Windsor YMCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Pierre Cantin</td>
<td>Centre de Formation Multidisciplinaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachelle Pascoe</td>
<td>Adult Language and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deslauriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Williamson</td>
<td>London Cross Cultural Learning Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ontario East Focus Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yoko Kazama</td>
<td>St. Lawrence College Job Connect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faiza Ahmad</td>
<td>Harmony House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Krakowsky</td>
<td>New Roots Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucya Spencer</td>
<td>Immigrant Women’s Services Ottawa (IWSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikram Hussein Ahmed</td>
<td>Somali Centre for Family Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Ferro</td>
<td>Quinte United Immigrant Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa Moher</td>
<td>Pinecrest – Queensway Community Health Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Attieh</td>
<td>Lebanese &amp; Arab Social Services Agency (LASSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine Rukebesha</td>
<td>Y-NIC/LARC (Newcomer Information Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khandra Ali</td>
<td><a href="mailto:khandra@CIC.CA">khandra@CIC.CA</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Tang</td>
<td>Ottawa Chinese Community Service Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snezana Minic</td>
<td>IWSO (Language Interpretation Services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloon Omar</td>
<td>CRCBU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negar Cachtari</td>
<td>Private Practitioner (Immigration Law)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Community Member/Client Focus Group

To gain an understanding of the needs/priorities of non-English speaking newcomers, a focus group was organized at Rexdale Women’s Centre (Toronto West). Sixteen attendees provided us with their input.
Appendix C: LITS Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

A Study of the Need for Language Interpretation and Translation Services (LITS) in the Delivery of Immigrant Settlement Programs

Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

Context

The first Canada Ontario Immigration Agreement (COIA) was signed in November 2005. This agreement outlines federal and provincial roles and responsibilities in immigration and integration. It also provides additional federal funding of 920 million dollars over five years for settlement and language training services for newcomers to Ontario. The primary objectives and areas of activity for the agreement are to improve outcomes for newcomers, to increase economic benefits of immigration and to engage municipalities in immigration and integration activities related to their interests. Additionally, as a result of COIA, there is an opportunity to review and improve existing service delivery models to ensure that they are needs based, client oriented and flexible.

The purpose of this study is to review interpretation and translation services related to immigrant settlement services in Ontario including:

1. Identify the current needs for this service as expressed by:
   a. Settlement service providing organizations
   b. Immigrant newcomers
   c. Funders of immigrant settlement services
   d. Other organizations that work with immigrant newcomers such as healthcare
2. Study the current delivery of interpreter services at ISAP agencies
3. Reviewing the best practices of interpreter and translation services in the health, justice and social service sectors as well as across jurisdictions, including Ontario (Toronto, northern, remote, Peel and York), B. C. Eastern Canada and 3 – 4 international jurisdictions
4. Reviewing and listing external sources of interpreter services that may be accessed by service providing organizations on a fee for service basis, through volunteers or available at no cost to the users
5. Identify gaps in the current system
6. Recommend improvements and/or new service delivery models for interpretation and translation services

Traditionally, interpreter services have been provided by settlement agency staff and volunteers who had some knowledge of the language of the newcomer. The newcomer’s family members had from time to time fulfilled the interpreter role as well. There is a wide range of interpreter standards available ranging form those required to represent an individual at legal proceedings to the casual explanation of every day situations.
Roles & Responsibilities

Responsibilities of the LITS Advisory Committee

The responsibilities of the LITS Advisory Committee are to:

- Provide advice on stakeholder consultation, including assisting in the identification of key stakeholders.
- Review reports, presentations and other material to provide feedback.
- Provide input on sector translation and interpretation needs.

Responsibilities of the CIC Project Team

The responsibilities of the CIC Project Team are to:

- Recommend and approve Advisory Committee membership.
- Provide initial list of key interviewees – nationally and internationally.
- Provide direction and support to project efforts.
- Approve reports, presentations on a timely basis with feedback.
- Enable the availability of CIC resources throughout the project.

Responsibilities of the PSTG Consulting Project Team

The responsibilities of the PSTG Consulting Project Team are to:

- Provide direction on project deliverables.
- Provide strategic advice.
- Development of deliverables.
- Maintain work plan.
- Facilitate formation of Advisory Committee.
- Facilitate consultations.
- Review and analysis of background materials.

Membership

The Advisory Committee will be chaired by the CIC project representative.

Members include:

Nora Angeles, Director – Barbara Schlifer Clinic
Cathy Woodbeck, Executive Director – Thunder Bay Multicultural Association
Latha Sukumar, Executive Director – Multicultural Community Interpreter Services
Axelle Janczur, Executive Director – Access Alliance
Kathleen Thomas, Executive Director – Multicultural Council of Windsor Essex
Lucya Spencer, Executive Director – Immigrant Women Services Ottawa (IWSO)
Rosanna Thoms, Executive Director - Information Niagara
Meetings

The LITS Advisory Committee will meet on a monthly basis (if necessary). Exact meeting times will be determined by the Chair in consultation with the committee and agendas will be forwarded to all members prior to meetings. Written summaries of the meetings including recommendations and actions for follow-up will be put forward and be maintained and made available to all working group members.
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1. Introduction

The purpose of this document is to:
- present the findings from a review of interpretation and translation services in other sectors and jurisdictions;
- to provide an analysis of how these findings are applicable to the language interpretation and translation services provided in the immigration settlement sector in Ontario;
- to offer recommendations to inform subsequent phases of this project, and
- to provide information to integrate into the findings and recommendations presented in the project final report.

The review focused the delivery of interpretation and translation services in other sectors (health care, other social services) and also provides information on other jurisdictions (both within Canada and internationally). This was done to get a broad perspective both within and outside Ontario regarding the delivery of interpretation and translation services.

2. Research Methodology

Information was collected through an iterative process and included the use of snowballing, personal knowledge, the published literature and grey literature, as well as telephone interviews. Key reports and pieces of literature were gathered based on our knowledge of the sector and through suggestions from some of the Project Advisory Committee members. Extensive web searching was also conducted using general keywords in particular sectors and jurisdictions.

Another significant component of the review included interviews with the Advisory Committee members. This was done to gather their knowledge about the sector and about how the organizations they are representing deliver interpretation and translation services. Interviews were also conducted with a few additional key contacts in other jurisdictions and sectors as a way to gain insight not available on the web or through reports or literature.

All of the data that was collected is represented in the summary of findings, and details about each are listed at the end of the document.

3. Research Limitations

The findings presented reflect the information that was either accessible to us or available through our personal knowledge, web research, and interviews. Keeping this in mind, we have tried to balance the information we collected so that it covers different sectors and jurisdictions relevant to this review. For example, there was a lot of information available related to the health care sector. We have included this material in our review because it is applicable and important, but we have tried to ensure that it does not dominate our findings and is balanced with information we collected on other sectors.
This review does not discuss how individual service provider organizations (e.g., how individual hospitals) meet client interpretation needs as subsequent phases of the project will collect this information. Some of the literature and related reports touch on the techniques and processes used by individual organizations to address language barriers, and this information is included where relevant, but it is not a focus of this document and will instead be covered in greater detail in the final report.

4. Summary of Findings

Other Sectors in Ontario

The following sections provide an overview of the processes and practices used to provide interpretation and translation services in other sectors in Ontario. Sectors that are covered include the Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration Domestic Violence Interpretation Program, other social services organizations, the Courts System and health care.

Domestic Violence Interpretation Program

There are currently 10 organizations across Ontario that receive funding from the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration (MCI) to coordinate and arrange the interpreter services required by local organizations providing services to people who are experiencing domestic violence. The organizations requesting interpreter services include shelters, legal aid services, the police force, housing authorities, schools, hospitals, and other health care agencies. Interpreters are provided to these organizations upon request through the coordinating bodies and are paid for through an annual funding allocation provided by MCI. The responsibilities of both parties are outlined in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) document. Note that MCI provides the funding based on the services provided, but does not provide funding for the administration of the program. The coordinating bodies must all find other funding sources to pay for the administration component and most of these organizations also provide interpretation and some translation services to other organizations on a fee-for-service cost recovery basis. It was noted that although many of the coordinating organizations are not large and do not have excessive administrative costs or overhead, arranging interpreters is a labour-intensive process. One or two people are typically responsible for receiving the interpreter requests and contacting (through phone, email, or fax) potential interpreters from a roster of individuals to see who is available and to make the necessary arrangements. This can take considerable time because of the back and forth contact needed to find an available interpreter and make the necessary arrangements.

The program is managed through a shared database that is used to keep track of the roster of interpreters as well as each of the interpreter encounters. This is used as a tool by the coordinating organizations and also as a reporting mechanism for MCI to understand how the services are being delivered (i.e. the organization receiving the services, the time required to deliver the services, the interpreter used to deliver the service, etc.). Information on each interpreter is also entered into the database and, based on the interpreter agreeing to share their information, is accessible by the other 10 organizations. This gives the network the ability to draw on a larger roster of potential
interpreters as they can contact interpreters from other areas. It is also useful for the interpreters because they have the option to provide additional services and increase their income.

The coordinating organizations typically require at least 24 hours to book an interpreter for a meeting; however, many also offer telephone interpreting services for smaller assignments (i.e. assisting someone to book an appointment) or in crisis situations where 24 hours notice is not possible. Many of the organizations felt that face-to-face interpretation was the ideal situation, but they were open to using telephone interpretation for shorter and less complicated encounters or in crisis situations. Some organizations use their roster of interpreters to complete the phone assignments, but some also use private ‘tele-interpreting’ services when required.

At the initiation of this program in the mid-1980s, MCI also developed a training curriculum for the organizations to ensure that interpreters had the appropriate training. This laid the groundwork for the majority of the training that is now provided through the coordinating bodies or through local Community College programs. Some of the coordinating organizations have built on this training and have customized it for their use, while others use the same program that was initially developed. When the program began, MCI provided funding for the training programs, but this was changed in the last few years and the training is no longer publicly funded. Each interpreter is now responsible for paying for their own training program as well as the fees for language testing. These fees can range from $450 to $1000 and include approximately 75 hours of training (depending on the organization). For the languages that are in high demand (e.g., Spanish), the interpreters are able to recover this fee quickly. In other languages that are in less demand, the fee is more difficult to recover and can act as a deterrent for some individuals to become interpreters. This has made it difficult for some of the organizations to find and train interpreters for the full roster of languages that is needed. It should also be noted that the requests these organizations receive for different languages changes over time and a language that is popular now will not necessarily be popular in six months. This means that interpreters cannot be guaranteed a certain volume of work which makes it difficult to predict their income levels and whether or not the payment for training and testing is worthwhile for them.

For the majority of the 10 coordinating organizations, the following training and testing requirements are in place:

- Fluency in English and/or French
- Successful completion of the ILISAT or CILISAT Language Test
- High school diploma (some organizations require this while others do not specify)
- Availability and ability to pay for training – approximately 75 hours and $450 to $1000 – training delivered through organization or Community College
- Either knowledge about certain issues (e.g., violence against women) or willingness to take additional professional development courses (e.g., additional training for interpreting in the health care sector)
- Successfully pass police check

There can be a high turnover of interpreters in these organizations (higher for the less popular languages) as the work is typically part-time with no guarantee of income. Often interpreters finish the training and then find full-time or part-time positions elsewhere. Some find full-time or part-time positions while also staying on the roster of interpreters.
This can be a good situation as they have the potential to earn extra income from the interpreting assignments, but it can be difficult for the coordinating organizations to manage as the time availability of these interpreters is more limited. It can also be very expensive for the interpreters to get from assignment to assignment. Some of the organizations assist with this by paying for travel costs (e.g., reimbursement for travel over 25 km), but fees such as parking are not typically covered.

Many of the interpreter organizations also noted that while the funding provided for these services is beneficial to those receiving the interpreting services, there is a limited funding allocation and it is not possible, in many circumstances, to provide enough interpreters to supply the current demand. One organization mentioned that they are able to provide services to their existing organizational clients, but they do not advertise their services as they would be unable to keep up with demand with additional organizations. They believe there would be additional demand for the services if more organizations knew about the program.

Many of the coordinating organizations also provide training to the service provider organizations that use the interpreter services. This varies per organization, but includes activities such as community outreach and education, training of individual service providers when they are new to interpreting, new and ongoing training and orientation for service provider organization staff, and education of service providers by interpreters at each encounter.

Many of the interpreter organizations also provide translation services. These services are all provided through a fee-for-service structure. The training that the organizations require of their translators differs significantly per organization and there is no set training program. Some of the organizations use interpreters that are also able to translate, while others use College or University trained individuals. All of the organizations noted that this is a much smaller component of their business compared to the interpreter services they deliver.

**Social Service Organizations**

The 10 organizations referenced above also provide services to other social services agencies in their local area on a fee-for-service cost recovery basis. The process they use to coordinate these services and the interpreters that deliver the services (including the training requirements) are the same as the MCI program.

The clients that are part of the fee-for-service process include the Police, Children’s Aid, hospitals, other health care agencies, Legal Aid, lawyers, etc. The interpretation services provided to these agencies often are of less demand than the MCI program, but are available and used if needed. In many cases, these social service agencies use a variety of methods to communicate with clients (bilingual staff, volunteer interpreters, full-time staff interpreters, other means) and do not have the budget allocated to pay for the fee-for-service amount (typically between $25-$30/hour with a minimum 2 hour charge). One of the interpreter organizations noted that they receive calls from service providers looking to book an interpreter, but many of these people cancel the request once they learn that there is a charge involved.

Legal Aid Ontario specifically informs their professionals, through their public website, to use one of the 10 MCI-funded agencies to gain access to interpreters when required.
Professionals are informed to use the Domestic Violence Program when working with someone who meets the criteria and that any other interpretation or translation services are provided through pre-negotiated Legal Aid Ontario rates through the 10 MCI-funded organizations (the rates are slightly less than the fee-for-service rates charged to other social services agencies). Professionals are also encouraged to contact local cultural and community agencies that may provide free interpretation services. These interpreters are not typically trained to the extent of those working for the interpreter organizations, but this is not mentioned on the public Legal Aid Ontario website.

Peel Family Mediation Services provides free interpretation or bilingual services to its clientele when needed. They have made a concerted effort to hire mediators that speak the languages commonly required in the area and hire interpreters for other languages as needed through a for-profit organization called the Universal Interpreter Services of Peel. They typically only require outside interpreters 3-4 times/year. This system has worked quite well for them and they have been able to use this structure to communicate with their clientele.

**The Courts System**

Interpretation and translation in the courts system is handled differently than the other social service programs previously identified because the interpreters are required to be professionally certified under the title of “Certified Court Interpreter”. This designation is administered by the Association of Translators and Interpreters of Ontario (ATIO). This designation is to guarantee a level of quality of interpreter services. It can only be acquired after a person has completed a university degree in their professional category and has letters of reference from either employers or clients. The annual membership fee for interpreters and translators to be certified through the ATIO is approximately $300. This gives an interpreter and translator the required certification and puts them on the ATIO professional directory.

The ATIO also provides the court system with a list of their certified interpreters and translators and these individuals can pay an annual fee (ranging from $375 to $850 depending on the geographic area where information is distributed) to be part of the ATIO job offer distribution service that courts use when locating certified interpreters and translators.

The Law Foundation of Ontario is also in the process of conducting a study to look at ways in which access to legal information and legal services for people who do not speak English or French or who live in remote or rural areas in Ontario can be improved. We will reference this report if it is released prior to the completion of this project.

**Health Care**

As previously mentioned, there has been much research and many reports published on the use of interpreters in the health care sector. This is for a variety of reasons including the large size of the sector, the liability issues that are intensified because of the high level of personal information collected, issues around the proper diagnosis and treatment of illness, as well as concerns related to informed consent. Note that the research mainly focused on interpretation services (and not as much on translation services) as many of the encounters in this sector are face-to-face.
There is Canadian legislation, albeit ‘weak’ in terms of clarity and enforceability for interpretation, that has been cited in the literature as a guiding factor for the use of interpreters in health care. Reports cite the Canada Health Act and the principle of Universal Access to health services as the reason that health care organizations should ensure adequate interpreter services are provided. However, federal legislation is not always reinforced at the provincial level where health care services are delivered and managed.

The research showed that there are a variety of practices used in the health care sector in Ontario in the provision of interpreter services. It was found that many health care organizations use a combination of processes to fulfil their health care interpreter requirements. Many hire bilingual staff members, use volunteers, use telephone services and hire interpreters through agencies. It was found that in most areas, there was a low level of trained interpreters used by health care organizations across Canada and that those organizations using ad hoc interpreters reported error rates (e.g., omissions, additions, substitutions and misinformation that resulted in medical errors) in 31% to 50% of cases (Strengthening Access to Primary Health Care, 2006).

**Example of Health Care Interpreting Service: Access Alliance**

Access Alliance is a not-for-profit community health and social services agency that provides interpretation and translation services within its organization and also to other health care and social service organizations in the Greater Toronto area. Their services are provided exclusively on a fee-for-service basis. The organization has adopted the service model from of the Domestic Violence Interpretation Program, although they are not funded through this initiative. They also use a similar training and screening program for their interpreters.

The organization provides translation services, but this is now done by sub-contracting with another organization. The sub-contractor is a for-profit organization that gives Access Alliance a preferred customer rate and also donates a portion of their proceeds back to the not-for-profit sector (including Access Alliance). Access Alliance previously provided translation services in-house; however, they found the process to be highly labour intensive and found quality assurance to be difficult. They have found the sub-contractor relationship to be a successful way to provide translation services to their clients without the additional administrative difficulties.

The organization also uses an automated dispatching and tracking software system to manage their interpreter services. When a request comes in for a service, the dispatch program immediately sends a message to the roster of interpreters in the given language, an interpreter responds, the dispatch program provides them with the information about the assignment and the interpreter then confirms their attendance directly with the service provider. After the interpreter completes the assignment, they have the service provider complete the required form, and the interpreter submits the form back to Access Alliance. Information from the form is then entered into the software system which creates the statement for the service provider as well as the payment for the interpreter. The organization has found that this software eliminates some of the back and forth previously required between service providers and interpreters. The main reason for putting this system in place was to assist with the high volume of requests. The system has been in place for two years now and has been very successful.
Access Alliance is able to keep a large roster of interpreters with many languages, but they noted it is sometimes difficult to manage the high turnover rate of their interpreters and it can be difficult to get interpreters for lower volume languages or languages new to Ontario. There is a high turnover rate for a variety of reasons, but this is mostly due to difficult working conditions. For example, interpreters are not paid for travel between assignments (ie. it is difficult for this to be a full-time job as 7 hours of billed worked typically means putting in a 10 hour day), they do not receive compensation for things such as travel, cell phone usage, and parking, and the work is stressful as interpreters are often required to relay difficult information about a patient or client (e.g., a poor diagnosis).

Other Jurisdictions

The following section provides information about interpretation and translation services delivered in other jurisdictions. The specific jurisdictions that were reviewed include Australia, United States, United Kingdom, British Columbia, and Quebec. These jurisdictions were identified in the literature, through our personal knowledge, and through interviews with key informants as areas that were applicable in the study of interpretation and translation services.

Australia

Australia has been very proactive at the national level on their approach to the provision of language services. In 1984, they commissioned a study to determine whether or not a national policy on language provision was required. The study’s main recommendation was to move forward with a national policy and after extensive consultation, The National Policy on Languages (NPL) was adopted by Cabinet in June, 1987. Both State and Territory governments have adopted the guiding principles of the NPL and have developed policies, structures, and programs to address the national framework.

Language Australia was an organization founded by the national government in 1989 in response to the NPL. This organization is charged with conducting high level specialist policy advising, publishing and consultancy for various policy and research efforts across the country.

Victoria is one of Australia’s most culturally diverse states. The Multicultural Victoria Act was passed by Parliament in December 2004 as a way to address the national language policy while addressing existing state policy and legislation related to multiculturalism. The Act ensures that all Victorians are treated with equality, fairness and respect. This piece of legislation has had a significant impact on language service provision and several initiatives have resulted.

The Victorian Multicultural Commission now operates under the Multicultural Victoria Act and has a responsibility to promote access to government and related services by linguistically diverse communities. They are involved in many initiatives to support this mandate. For example, they have implemented a public Interpreter Card, displaying the National Interpreter Symbol, which the public are encouraged to obtain and use to communicate that they have a preferred language other than English. This was done to
help raise awareness by the consumers as well as the service providers about the use of interpreters. They also provide scholarships for students able to speak specific languages who are enrolled in the recognized interpreter training program (note: the list of languages changes based on current need). The scholarship amount is $1,200 and covers course fees, study materials, and other expenses such as transportation or childcare services. The Commission also offers a language allowance for people who are bilingual and use a language other than English on the job (is not applicable for individuals who use other languages as a requirement of their job). The allowance is approximately $800 - $1,500 per year depending on the level accreditation they receive.

The Commission is also involved in training staff in health care institutions to be more aware of the need to use interpreters and how to do this effectively. In addition, they publish a report card document that outlines all of their accomplishments and successes in the area of language services.

Interpreters and translators are also accredited through a national body called the National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters (NAATI). This body accredits interpreters and translators at different levels of competence so that there is a common level of training and qualifications for interpreters and translators across the country. Social service agencies are encouraged by the government to use interpreters and translators who have been accredited through NAATI.

The government also recommends that service provider organizations use professional interpreting and translating agencies to seek services when there is a low or changing demand and where there is a high or stable demand, to potentially hire full-time or part-time staff to fulfil this role.

**United States**

The United States is mandated, through the Civil Rights Act of 1964, to provide appropriate language services to its citizens. This Act, under Title VI, states that discrimination on the basis of national origin, as it affects persons with limited English proficiency, is prohibited. This legislation has had a significant impact on the ways in which language services are provided throughout the social services sector and beyond.

The ways in which this legislation has been interpreted has been segmented by sector and by state. In the health care sector, several states require health care organizations to comply with the Federal guidelines by providing appropriate interpretation services. These services must be effective and timely so that clients do not experience unreasonable delays and do not experience any differences in the services they receive based on their ability to speak the language.

For example, Washington State now has a system of qualified trained interpreters in place due to complaints received against hospital and social service organizations. The State of Massachusetts has also passed legislation that requires hospital emergency departments to provide interpreter services to patients who do not speak English. This legislation also clarifies that the interpreters must have the appropriate medical training and be competent in their delivery of interpretation services (Position Paper on Interpretation in Heath Care in Toronto).
The Government of Massachusetts has also developed a best practices document outlining the key characteristics needed for a successful interpretation and translation program for service delivery organizations (specifically hospitals). The characteristics include:

- The program is structured rather than ad hoc, with comprehensive written policies and procedures;
- The program includes regular, systematic assessment of the language needs of people in the service area;
- The program uses the community needs assessment and an assessment of its own resources in determining what types of oral language assistance to include in its delivery system;
- The program establishes specific training and competency protocols for both interpreters and providers; and
- The program has a monitoring and evaluation system in place. (Best Practice Recommendations for Hospital-Based Interpreter Services)

Many health care and social service organizations in the US use bilingual staff and volunteers to provide language interpretation services. This can be done successfully when the actual person providing the service speaks the other language, but the results have not been favourable when using a person from another department (without appropriate training). Studies have shown that information is commonly interpreted incorrectly when untrained staff or volunteers are used as interpreters.

The literature also noted that organizations in the US, and in particular hospitals, have been the most successful in providing appropriate interpreter services when the responsibility for interpreters is centralized in the organization (note: this is also the case in Ontario). For example, Boston Medical Central contributes $2.2 million USD annually to its interpreter program that is centrally staffed and managed. Based on the high volume of requests they receive, each interpreter interaction costs the hospital approximately $18. The program uses full-time, part-time and on-call interpreters to fulfil their needs and they also have translation specialists available when needed. A sophisticated telecommunications system is in place to support the coordination of interpreter services and all interpreters and providers receive training from the organization (Quality Healthcare for Linguistically Diverse Patient Populations, March 22, 2004).

**United Kingdom**

The requirement to provide interpretation and translation services for non-English speaking citizens is outlined in the following European and United Kingdom pieces of law:

- The European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms 1950
- Human Rights Act 1998
- The Disability Discrimination Act 1995
The Race Relations Amendment Act 2000

Although this legislation articulates individual rights in receiving services in a language other than English, there is no piece of legislation that specifically requires local organizations to provide interpretation or translation services. This means that the use of interpreters and translators varies across the UK and provision of these services depends on each local area.

The City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council has been pro-active in this area and has developed an equality and diversity statement with an accompanying policy as well as guidelines to provide direction for the services that are provided in their area. The Council has outlined the following points to consider when using an interpreter:

- The use of “informal interpreters” e.g. family members, children and friends should be avoided since this can compromise confidentiality.
- Bilingual staff should only be used in cases where there is an existing agreement or the provision of interpretation is one of the duties included in their job description.
- The interpreter is fluent in the language of the client and speaks the same dialect.
- If the interpreter is required to interpret technical or specialist information, he/she must be briefed prior to the meeting.
- The cost of using an interpreter could be substantial. It is therefore essential to get the right person for interpretation.

They also outlined the following points to consider when using translation services:

- To check whether the translation of the material you require has been produced by central government or another relevant agency. This may save you time and money.
- To use plain, simple and grammatically correct English in all documents that are being considered for translation.
- Recognize that translation is a supplement to interpreting and other communication services and not a substitute.
- As assessment of the benefit of translation against using an interpreter or an audiotape.
- An indication of the cost of translation of any document being prepared for public use.
- An assessment of the need for a document to be translated in full as against a shorthand version or a summary.
- Provision for the proof reading of all documents for accuracy, readability and appropriateness.
- Consideration should be given to the target audience. How will they be reached and is translation the best way to meet their needs or could alternative modes of communication may be more appropriate.
A variety of for-profit organizations provide interpretation and translation services to public sector and social service organizations in the United Kingdom. These organizations tend to provide these services in many languages, use trained interpreters and translators and pay competitive rates.

**British Columbia**

A notable project was initiated in British Columbia in the mid-1990s called the Health Care Interpreter Partnership Project (HCIPP). The project raised awareness about interpreter services in the Province by creating standards and training programs. The interpreter services currently in place were influenced by this initiative.

Interpreter services in the province are currently provided in a number of ways. Most interpreters are contracted by health service organizations through a local coordinating body and are paid on a fee-for-service basis. Organizations also use volunteer interpreters, bilingual staff, and staff interpreters to fill their demand for these services. The Provincial Language Service is a large non-governmental organization that was created to manage the delivery of interpreter services for the BC health system. It was initially developed as a government agency, but has since been changed to a ‘cost recovery agency’ with no core government funding and is funded completely through a fee-for-service structure. Since this change, the organization has expanded and provides services to other social service agencies as well as private sector organizations (see below for additional information).

Other Health Authorities in the province have created their own centralized interpreter services for the organizations in their geographic region. These agencies operate on a fee-for-service basis and use an information technology software systems to track and dispatch interpreters.

**Example of Interpreting Service: The Provincial Language Service**

As previously explained, the Provincial Language Service is a large organization originally created to provide interpretation and translation services for the BC health care system, but has since become a private agency and delivers these services to many additional social services as well as some private sector organizations. Examples of their clientele include Worksafe BC and the Greater Vancouver Transit System.

Interpretation services are provided on a fee-for-service basis through a centralized contact centre that matches the requested interpreter service with the appropriate interpreter in the specific local area. These individuals are required to have gone through the training program provided by the organization (at a cost of approximately $400 to the interpreters) or have gone through an equivalent program through a Community College. They are also required to pass the language proficiency testing required by the organization. Court interpreters are also available through this organization and these individuals are required to pass the test specifically created for court interpreters.

Translation services are also provided through a separate department that has a separate roster of trained translators. The translation department coordinates the
delivery of the translation services through their roster of translators and can have the documents tested by the local community to ensure they are of the highest level of quality. The translators are required to be certified through a recognized professional body such as the American Translators Association.

The organization also has a consulting department that goes out to work with different organizations to help them develop the policies and procedures that help the service providers to access interpreter services when needed. These services have included assisting organizations in setting-up specific budgets to fund interpretation and translation services.

**Quebec**

In Quebec, provincial legislation was amended in the late 1980s to ensure that people not able to speak English or French could access the health and social services they required. A new agency was created in Montreal to address this change – The Interregional Interpreter Bank (IBB) – to enable organizations to have access to a centralized interpreter service. This organization coordinated the delivery of interpreter services to the health care organizations in Quebec on a fee-for-service basis with a minimum two hour charge. The administration of the program was funded by the Quebec government with an additional 10% fee added to each fee-for-service bill to assist with the cost of administering the program. The full fee-for-service amount collected from each health care organization is then paid directly to the interpreter. It is up to each organization to decide whether or not an interpreter is required, however, the IBB publicizing on their public website that interpreter services may be made available and that individuals should review their interpreter needs with the health care organization they are involved with.

Each health care organization develops their own policies and procedures related to the use of interpreters, however, the IBB has the role of educating and training the organizations about the provincial and regional interpretation policies. This is done through professional forums, cross-cultural training and staff orientation. A software application is also used by the agency to coordinate the booking of interpreters as well as the billing and payment processes.

Organizations in Quebec are also mandated to appoint a Service Quality Commissioner, through their regular Accreditation process, to address issues specific to the quality of communications with patients. This process ensures that organizations use quality interpreters even though there is no specific training or standards for the province. Organizations typically use trained interpreters, even if the services are provided independently and not through the IBB.
5. Analysis and Interpretation

The findings from this review will be used to inform subsequent phases of this project. For example, during the stakeholder consultation phase some of the points articulated in this section will be further addressed. The findings are organized by topic areas which have surfaced as important themes during this review. The topic areas include legislation and policy, funding, training and quality, approach to administering services, and public knowledge about services.

Legislation and Policy

It appears, based on this review, that those jurisdictions that are the most proactive and effective in delivering interpretation and translation services have a legislative and/or policy framework in place that informs the organizations about the requirements for providing interpretation and translation services. Without this framework, decisions related to the delivery of language services are up to a specific region, local area, sector, or service provider organization. This creates uneven provision of and quality of services.

From this review it was found that the legislative and policy framework in Canada is not as strong as it is in other countries. The areas where there has been the greatest movement and advancement in the areas of interpretation and translation in Canada are those sectors where specific funding has been allocated to provide services (e.g., the Domestic Violence Interpretation Program). Without specific allocation of funding and a specific program to oversee this funding, the use of interpreter and translator services has been inconsistent.

Funding

In many of the sectors and jurisdictions reviewed, funding was one of the key elements of a successful interpretation and translation program. There were many different aspects to the funding topic and they are each discussed separately below.

Payment of Services

There were a couple of different successful models outlined for the payment of services. One example was the direct payment of services through the Domestic Violence Interpretation Program. These services are directly paid for by the provincial government and even though the current funding may not fully meet the demand, the services are being delivered and used by the appropriate service providers when needed. Another model that has been successful is where service provider organizations have allocated a specific budget for interpretation services, for example, the Boston Medical Centre. In this model, funding is allocated directly to the service provider organization (or is part of their overall budget) and the service provider organization manages their interpretation program internally.

Both of these models have worked in the given situation, however, the service provider organization has more flexibility in the way they use interpreters and translators in the second model. For example, they may hire some full-time staff for high demand languages and procure services for lower demand languages. This would not be possible in the government funded model as all of the services must be procured through the interpreter coordinating organizations. At the same time, the government
funded model allows the government to track detailed information about the interpretation and translation services provided which is beneficial for planning and accountability purposes.

**Funding for Training Interpreters**

Payment methods for training of interpreters and translators were a significant issue in this review. In the majority of examples, the individual interpreters and translators were responsible for the cost of training. This is because the training is similar to any other job-related training or education that individuals typically pay for (e.g., College or University degrees). The payment for training for languages of high demand (those languages where the interpreter or translator would be able to make back the investment in a short amount of time) was not a concern in any of the examples. For those languages, the interpreters and translators did not have a problem paying for the training. Payment for training became an issue for languages in lower demand. For those languages, the cost of training became a deterrent and it was more difficult for organizations to fill a roster of interpreters and translators with these languages. It is also difficult to keep these people on a roster after they are trained because many seek employment opportunities elsewhere.

Victoria, Australia has developed a beneficial practice in this area. They provide training grants for individuals looking to become interpreters in the specific languages that they are having difficulty recruiting for. By using this model, they are not committed to paying for all interpreter training programs, but have the flexibility to provide grants using their own criteria and based on the demand for languages that are under-serviced at a given time.

**Funding for Administration**

As was previously outlined, the coordination of interpreters and translators can be resource intensive. Whether or not the coordination is done by staff or is supported through technology, it costs money to provide the services. It was noted by some of the organizations in the Domestic Violence Interpretation Program that it was difficult to maintain the level of administration needed to provide the services when funding was not provided for this aspect of the program. In Quebec, the province has recognized that administration requires funding and assists with this cost. Interpreter and translator organizations also add an additional 10% fee to each statement to assist with the recovery of these costs.

Any new program should therefore, regardless of the funding model used, ensure there is adequate funding for the coordination of the interpreter and translator services.

**Training and Quality**

Training was shown to be critical in the delivery of quality interpretation and translation services. Whether individuals were paid to provide the services or whether they were volunteers, training was shown to be essential. The literature showed that there was a high level of errors made when interpretation and translation services were delivered by non-trained individuals and that even though a person can speak a second language, they may not necessarily have the skills required to interpret or translate. Although the use of volunteers would be acceptable if they were trained, it could be difficult to get
sufficient people if they were required to pay for the training. This may not be an option unless the training was provided free of charge.

The training program designed by MCI for the Domestic Violence Interpretation Program was considered adequate for the services provided by those agencies (note: some organizations have updated this training since its initial development). The Courts System, on the other hand, requires more extensive training and certification, while the Australian government requires their interpreters and translators to be accredited through a national body. The benefits of having trained interpreters in place are substantial and were shown in every jurisdiction as critical for success, however, there are a variety of different approaches for providing this training and ensuring that it is satisfactory. Training is also costly. There are additional costs required of interpreters and translators that are certified to provide services to the Courts and this extra cost may not make sense in the community sector. Further research would need to be conducted in this area to make a recommendation on the types of training that should be provided and whether or not certification and/or accreditation should be made mandatory.

It was also suggested that technology be used more advantageously to deliver training programs (e.g., online courses). This may decrease the cost of the training over the longer-term.

Quality control is also another important component of ensuring that services meet expectations. The Government of Massachusetts suggested that any interpretation or translation program have a monitoring and evaluation system in place as a way to measure quality.

**Approach to Administration of Services**

The model that is used to deliver the interpretation and translation services should be consistent with the funding model that is used. In the Domestic Violence Interpretation Program, the services were coordinated through a separate organization from the service provider organizations. This has enabled the provincial government to track and monitor the services delivered (through the software technology program that is used) and it ensures that a standard level of training is provided to all interpreters. This model has been successful for over 20 years. At the same time, it is sometimes difficult to determine whether or not an individual meets the criteria for the program. If this approach is used for the immigrant settlement sector, detailed criteria would need to be developed to clearly articulate eligibility requirements.

The second model is that services are coordinated at each service provider organization so that each organization either brings on full-time or part-time staff to fulfil the roles and/or procures services through existing interpreter and translator organizations. This is beneficial to the organization because they are given the authority and responsibility to decide how to use the funding provided to them (each model would differ based on the organizational needs). It could be more difficult; however, if the organizations do not have the infrastructure in place to manage these services themselves. If the organizations are small, they would likely procure most of the services from the interpreter organizations anyways. In this model, it may also be difficult to monitor and evaluate quality (at a systems level) as training and measurement would be done on an organization by organization basis.
In either of the models, there is a significant role for the interpretation and translation organizations. Regardless if the funding is allocated directly to the service provider organizations, there will be a need for coordinating bodies to provide interpretation and translation services, especially for the languages that are in less demand. Without these coordinating organizations, it would be more difficult for interpreters and translators to find work and it would be more time consuming for the service provider organizations to connect with the interpreters and translators. These organizations are also better positioned to anticipate changes in language needs.

**Public Knowledge about Services**

It was not within the scope of this review to understand how the delivery of interpretation and translation services should be communicated to the public, but there were some examples of how this was done in other areas that are worth noting. In Victoria, Australia, they have implemented a Public Interpretation Card that identifies a person’s preferred language of communication and whether or not they speak any other languages. In Quebec, information for the public is posted in their internet site which explains the steps they should take if they require language assistance.

In Ontario, it is currently up to the service provider organizations to determine whether or not an individual needs interpretation services. The research has shown that this approach is not always successful, and for a variety of reasons, individuals do not always get the interpretation services they require. Communication to the public about interpretation and translation services would ensure that individuals are aware of the services and are able to request them if needed.

### 6. Areas for Further Investigation

Consultations with the sector will be completed as part of this project and will inform the final report. These consultations will address the sector’s preferred model of interpretation and translation service delivery and understand the capacity the sector has to deliver the services.

Additional work should also be completed through a separate process to develop consensus regarding standards for the delivery of interpretation and translation services. Given that the settlement sector is currently addressing issues of standards in a number of areas (ie: professional standards, data standards, etc.), it may be timely to address standards required for the delivery of interpretation and translation services.

### 7. Concluding Remarks

The use of interpreters and translators is important in a multicultural society such as Ontario. These services are needed to ensure that people can communicate and understand each other. This review looked at other sectors and other jurisdictions to understand how interpretation and translation services should be delivered in the immigrant settlement sector. The report provided a review of this information as well as an analysis of the results that will be used to inform the final report.
8. List of Resources and Interviews

Resources


The Association of Translators and Interpreters of Ontario (ATIO) website – What is a Court Interpreter? Found at: http://www.atio.on.ca/info/what_is_court.asp.

The Association of Translators and Interpreters of Ontario (ATIO) website – Client Services. Found at: http://www.atio.on.ca/info/services.asp.


Healthcare Interpretation Network. “Strengthening Access to Primary Health Care in Ontario through Interpreter Services”.


**Individuals Interviewed (in Alphabetical order)**

- Angeles, Nora – Director, Barbara Schlifer Clinic
- Janczur, Axelle – Executive Director, Access Alliance
- Neilson, Chris on behalf of Suzanne Barclay – Director, The Provincial Language Service, Provincial Health Authority Vancouver, BC
- Spencer, Lucya – Executive Director, Immigrant Women Services Ottawa (IWSO)
- Thoms, Rosanna – Executive Director, Information Niagara
- Woodbeck, Cathy – Executive Director, Thunder Bay Multicultural Association