



# METROPOLIS BRITISH COLUMBIA

Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Diversity

## Working Paper Series

No. 07 - 13

May 2007

### **Changing the Mind of the City:**

***The Role of the Hastings Institute / EEO in  
Building Multicultural Readiness  
in Vancouver's Host Society***

**Samara Brock**

Series editor: Linda Sheldon, SFU;  
Dr. Krishna Pendakur, SFU and Dr. Daniel Hiebert, UBC, Co-directors

# **Metropolis British Columbia**

## ***Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Diversity***

MBC is supported as part of the Metropolis Project, a national strategic initiative funded by SSHRC and the following organizations of the federal government:

- Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA)
- Canada Border Services Agency
- Canada Economic Development for the Regions of Quebec (CED-Q)
- Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC)
- Canadian Heritage (PCH)
- Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC)
- Federal Economic Development Initiative for Northern Ontario (FedNor)
- Human Resources and Social Development Canada (HRSD)
- Department of Justice Canada
- Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC)
- Public Safety and Canada (PSC)
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP)
- The Rural Secretariat of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (Rural Sec't)
- Statistics Canada (Stats Can)

Metropolis BC also receives funding from the Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development (ALMD) of the Government of British Columbia. Grants from Simon Fraser University, the University of British Columbia and the University of Victoria provide additional support to the Centre.

Views expressed in this manuscript are those of the author(s) alone. For more information, contact the Co-directors of the Centre, Krishna Pendakur, Department of Economics, SFU ([pendakur@sfu.ca](mailto:pendakur@sfu.ca)) and Daniel Hiebert, Department of Geography, UBC ([daniel.hiebert@ubc.ca](mailto:daniel.hiebert@ubc.ca)).

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	5
INTRODUCTION	7
• Research Location: Vancouver	8
• Case Study: The Hastings Institute/ Equal Employment Opportunity program (EEO)	9
• Overview of Methodology	11
SETTING THE CONTEXT: MULTICULTURAL POLICIES	12
• Federal Government	12
• Some Limitations of Federal Policies	14
• Provincial Government – British Columbia	16
• Some Limitations of Provincial Policies	17
• City of Vancouver Policies	18
• Limitations to Vancouver’s Policies	20
FINDINGS	20
• Origins of the Hastings Institute	21
• Organizational Development	24
• The Kingswood Years	25
• Approach to Training	27
• Changes over Time	28
• Why the Shift in Training Occurred	30
• Current Incarnation and Current Environment	35
• Impacts of Hastings Institute/ EEO Training	37
• Elements of Good Training and Other Approaches to Creating Change	42
• Ongoing Impact	42
• The Co-learning Approach	44

• Evolution over Time	47
• Looking Ahead: Suggestions for Improvement	48
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	51
• Shifts over Time	51
• Elements of Good Training and Other Approaches to Change	52
• Current Environment and <i>Suggestions for Improvement</i>	52
RECOMMENDATIONS	53
• Organizational Recommendations	53
• Reenergize Multicultural Initiatives	53
• Diversify City Staff	54
• Training Recommendations	55
• Focus on Transformative and Anti-racism Approaches	55
• Follow up and Ongoing Evaluation	56
• Recommendations for Other Municipal Multicultural Initiatives	57
• Civic Re-narration through Dialogue	57
• Recommendations for Provincial <i>and Federal Levels of Government</i>	58
• Provide Ongoing Direction and	
• Funding for Cross-Cultural Policies and Programs	58
• Ongoing Dialogue Regarding the Concept of Multiculturalism	59
• Active Provincial Engagement with Multiculturalism	60
CONCLUDING THOUGHTS	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY	61



## **METROPOLIS BRITISH COLUMBIA**

Centre of Excellence for Research on Immigration and Diversity

### **Working Paper Series**

## **Changing the Mind of the City: *The Role of the Hastings Institute / EEO in Building Multicultural Readiness in Vancouver's Host Society***

**Samara Brock**

#### ABSTRACT

The world is undergoing the largest human migration in history: that from rural to urban. It is expected that sixty percent of the world population will be urban by 2030. This unprecedented human migration will bring increasingly diverse populations together in growing urban centres, and Canada's cities are no exception to these global trends of urbanization and immigration. Immigrants make up 18 % of the population of Canada, with more than half living in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. While this diversity will help to enrich our cities, it could also mean increased ethnic tensions, and, in the worst cases, ghettoization or violence. This study looks at ways to engage Canada's current residents or "the host culture" in an active multiculturalism, in which

they learn to co-adapt with diverse immigrants. In particular, it focuses on training that has been carried out over the past fifteen years by the City of Vancouver's Hastings Institute and Equal Employment Opportunity program to build cross-cultural understanding in Vancouver's host society.

This case study looks at the impacts of such training over time and asks whether the programs of the Hastings Institute offer an effective approach to helping Canada's cities prepare for immigration. Relying on interviews carried out with past trainees, employees and trainers of the Hastings Institute and Equal Employment Opportunity program, as well as key documents such as Council reports and training materials, this study gives an overview of the work of this organization and recommends how Vancouver and other cities can better build multicultural readiness. It also discusses how provincial and federal governments can become more engaged in multicultural initiatives and programming at the local level. Overall, it finds that to better prepare Canada's host society for increasingly diverse cities, we must re-envision our approaches to multiculturalism at the local, provincial and federal levels.

## INTRODUCTION

In 2000, the challenge of accommodating new immigrant populations was identified by the federal Privy Council and Office of Intergovernmental Affairs as the leading policy challenge facing Canada's largest cities (Edgington and Hutton, 2002). The key task confronting these multicultural cities is whether they can create an inclusive political culture and promote intercultural coexistence (Sandercock, 2003). This is a significant challenge in a political environment where cut backs, and the downloading of responsibility from senior levels of government, have left integration largely to municipalities (Au, 2000). This is exacerbated by the fact that local authorities currently lack both the constitutional obligation and the financial support needed to respond to higher levels of immigration (Ley and Murphy, 2001, Edgington and Hutton 2002). The tension between the need to create intercultural cities and a lack of support for cities to take on this role is a key challenge in Canadian multicultural policy and programming. The need to engage the host society effectively in creating a welcoming society is another key challenge for multicultural policies and programming. Innovations that can aid in the transition from a passive or shallow multiculturalism to an active or rich multiculturalism, wherein new immigrants do not bear the responsibility of one-sided adaptation, need to be examined. How do we shift the focus of multicultural policy from "an institutional project which funds and promotes staged ethnic representations" (Mahtani, 2002: 74) to a more profound project with real impacts at the local level?

In part, the research outlined in this paper was undertaken to answer the following:

I would like to plea for more research on the complexities of migrant incorporation into transnational cities. The questions that arise in this context are legion, and we are far from having an adequate theoretical framework for understanding the dynamics of successful incorporation. Before such a framework can evolve, however, many more detailed studies are needed (Friedmann, 2002: 66).

This research looks at the challenge of preparing Canadian cities to effectively receive and integrate immigrants. It examines public policy efforts to engage members of the host society, specifically employees of public institutions, in active multicultural citizenship, and to counter institutional racism and discrimination. It focuses on the diversity and anti-discrimination work carried out by an organization established by the City of Vancouver, namely the Hastings Institute/ Equal Employment Opportunity program, in order to illuminate ways in which multiculturalism can be implemented at the city level. With a few notable exceptions, there is not much literature looking at strategies that have been implemented by municipal governments to respond to emerging polyethnic urban landscapes (Pestieau and Wallace, 2003: 255). This study therefore is intended to provide insight into the outcomes of an innovative and long-term approach carried out by the City of Vancouver, with the aim of illuminating how this work can be more effectively carried out in emerging polyethnic urban centres around the world.

*Research Location: Vancouver*

Vancouver, as a gateway city (Ley & Murphy, 2001), is a prime example of what Leonie Sandercock calls the mongrel city of the 21st century (Sandercock, 2003). One of the most prominent characteristics of the city of Vancouver is its increasing ethnic, racial and linguistic diversity. Immigrants make up 46% of Vancouver's population and 51.3% of the city's residents have a mother

tongue other than English (Statistics Canada, 2001). The majority of new immigrants to the city come from Asia – largely China, the Philippines and India. Although today Vancouver prides itself as being a multicultural city, we still see many struggles of racism, prejudice, and misunderstanding accompanying the high influx of newcomers. Over the past thirty years, the City of Vancouver has put in place some innovative programming to try to address issues linked to immigration. It is important to note that Vancouver is one municipality of 21 in the Greater Vancouver Regional District. By far the largest, with 27% of the population of the region, it is certainly not the only locus of immigration (GVRD, 2006). Municipalities such as Surrey and Richmond, for example, receive a large proportion of the region's immigration. The City of Vancouver has traditionally been at the forefront of both immigration and municipal multicultural policies in the region, and thus serves as a rich illustrative example for other municipalities in the GVRD and beyond.

*Case Study: The Hastings Institute/  
Equal Employment Opportunity program (EEO)*

One of the most ambitious of the City of Vancouver's multicultural initiatives has been the Hastings Institute/ Equal Employment Opportunity program. Though the focus of the research discussed in this paper was primarily on the Hastings Institute, the work of the EEO is often closely linked with it. Thus, they will be discussed in tandem throughout this paper. The EEO was established in 1977 to achieve the City of Vancouver's goal "to have a workforce that reflects the diversity of our community" (City of Vancouver, 2006a). The Hastings Institute was founded in 1989 to take some of the internal diversity training and cross-cultural communications strategies, developed for the City internally by the EEO, to a broader audience. Both the EEO and the Institute

currently deliver training on issues related to employment and service equity, diversity, cross-cultural relations, literacy, and harassment-free workplaces. The EEO does this internally within the City as well as providing informal and formal processes to deal with concerns of discrimination and harassment. The Hastings Institute provides training and consulting services externally for provincial government ministries, municipalities, crown corporations, community agencies and the private sector. In addition, the Hastings Institute/ EEO is also responsible for the Workplace Language Program. This is a program that operates both internally within the City of Vancouver and with outside institutions such as the University of British Columbia and the British Columbia Building Corporation. Through the City of Vancouver, employees can receive conversation and literacy training from the program at one half employee time, one half City time.

Currently, there are six permanent staff for both the Hastings Institute and EEO. Four of these are advisors, who carry out tasks such as planning, programming and budgeting. One of these advisors heads up the work of the Hastings Institute, while the rest work primarily for the EEO. In addition to these advisors there are two administrative staff. Finally, there are a number of trainers who work as consultants for the EEO's internal harassment training and Workplace Language Program as well as externally through the Hastings Institute's harassment training. These trainers have an array of academic training and hands-on experience. Though the organizations are closely linked, the Hastings Institute also has its own board, chaired by the mayor, which governs its operations. This is a direct result of then mayor, Gordon Campbell's, involvement in the creation of the organization in 1989, as well as an attempt in the early 1990s to have the Hastings Institute and EEO function as sepa-

rate organizations. Both of these points will be picked up on in the following discussion.

These initiatives offered a prime case study for this research as they were set up by a City with fast-changing demographics to prepare its employees and the broader population for these changes. Specifically, these organizations were created to engage members of the host society in a process of co-adaptation. This was a significant and ambitious innovation for a city to carry out and was on the leading edge of multicultural programming in this province and the country. The fact that this programming has been in place continuously for over fifteen years offers a rich case study of the shifting priorities and agendas of local, provincial and federal governments in terms of multicultural policy; and an opportunity to look retrospectively at some of the longer-term impacts that these initiatives had in the city of Vancouver.

### *Overview of Methodology*

The aim of this research was to access a diverse array of experiences regarding the cross-cultural training undertaken by the Hastings Institute/ EEO. Past and present employees, trainers, and participants in the programs over its twenty-year lifespan were interviewed. They were given the same set of general questions to answer; however, the interviews were left open-ended in order to allow the interviewees to pull out what they felt was important from their experience with the Hastings Institute / EEO. Gathering an historical analysis of the work of the Institute and people's perceptions of the work was a key part of the inquiry. This was done to give greater context to the work of the Institute and the various forces which have shaped it over time. If the ultimate aim of this research is to draw conclusions for what municipalities could be doing in terms of building multicultural readiness for receiving new

immigrants, this perspective is key in giving a concrete and rich example of how this has been attempted.

This research relied on a number of key sources. Primarily, the findings are drawn from twelve interviews with administrators, trainers and trainees of the organization. In addition to my own interviews, the impacts section references three reports. The first is an impact assessment report conducted by external consultants on Hastings Institute training in 1990 which was created through interviews, questionnaires and focus groups. The second is a collection of raw interviews collected for a directed studies project by students at B.C.I.T in 1992. The third is an analysis carried out in 2000 by the City of North Vancouver of different municipalities' degree of engagement with multiculturalism. Finally, I also drew upon the Institute's past and current training material to further inform this discussion.

## SETTING THE CONTEXT: MULTICULTURAL POLICIES

Multicultural programming in Vancouver exists within a framework of policies developed at the federal, provincial and municipal government level. These policies frame, empower, and at times restrain the work of building cross-cultural understanding. In order to further set the context for a discussion of the work of the Hastings Institute/ EEO, this section outlines the Federal, Provincial and Municipal policies and examines their limitations.

### *Federal Government*

Canadian multiculturalism became permanently embedded in both the Canadian imagination and political discourse beginning in 1971, when Canada became the first country in the world to introduce a policy on multiculturalism (Canadian Heritage, 2006a). It was a questioning of the relevance of the on-

going bicultural debate between English and French Canada by those who felt they fell into neither category that gave rise to Canada's first step towards multicultural policy (Hiebert, Collins, and Spoonley, 2003, Fleras and Elliot, 1999). Though still privileging the identity of English and French Canadians as the founding nations (completely overlooking the First Nations who were here long before Europeans), early multicultural legislation acknowledged the changing demographic makeup of Canada in the post-war period. As the idea of multiculturalism evolved it came to encompass broad issues such as the rights of individuals to retain their culture (versus notions of assimilation), the provision of services to immigrants, and anti-discrimination (Hiebert et al., 2003). These notions became deeply embedded in a broad range of laws, policies and international agreements such as: the Employment Equity Act (1986), the Pay Equity Act (1985), the Multiculturalism Act (1988). Multiculturalism as a central tenet of Canadian society was also enshrined in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982 (Canadian Heritage, 2006b). As the idea of Canada as a multicultural nation has gained prevalence, multiculturalism has begun to trickle into provincial and municipal policy and legislation as well.

The need for multicultural policy has been driven by the need for continuing immigration to Canada as outlined by senior levels of government involved in the task of nation-building. Canada has always needed immigrants, as labourers, as stimulus for the economy, and more recently as tax-paying supporters for an ageing population (Fleras and Elliot, 1999, Baxter, 1998). The puzzle for legislators and government officials who saw the necessity in increasing levels of immigration to Canada has been how to frame Canada's national identity to include those whose arrival the country depended upon, but who were not necessarily a part of the established national identity. Early attempts at solving this issue centered on shaping immigration laws to ensure

that those who came would be easily incorporated into existing hegemonic European, and largely Anglo-European, cultural norms. This has always been an unattainable ideal, however. Cultural others, from the First Nations who occupied the territory prior to European colonization to early Dukabour and Chinese immigrants onwards, have always posed a challenge to (Western) Eurocentric notions of "Canadianess." Multicultural policy has thus always been about more than managing the coexistence of disparate groups of people. It has, at its most fundamental, been about changing the story of a nation to include multiple identities, multiple histories, and multiple ways of being Canadian.

#### *Some Limitations of Federal Policies*

Canadian multicultural policies are commended for having promoted the importance and understanding of multiculturalism not just in Canada, but also around the world (Fleras and Elliot, 1999: 318). The federal government has succeeded at dispersing multicultural policy through many acts, departments and programs, thus making multiculturalism an integral component of governance at the federal level. However, there is still much debate about how successful Canada has been at changing the core story in which its citizens' identities are embedded.

The irony of political discourse around multiculturalism in Canada, and in other countries that have embraced multiculturalism, is that immigrants, who are seen as solutions to challenges facing the nation (usually economic), often come to be seen as challenges to nationhood themselves. Some argue that this is due to the fact that Federal multicultural policies have failed to build an understanding within the host culture of their own ethnicity and culture (Sandercock, 2003 and Mahtani, 2002). The majority of policies focus on the

need for “ethnic” populations to adapt to that of the dominant society and do not overtly address underlying issues of racism, exclusion or ghettoization, nor the need of the host society, themselves an ethnic group, to co-adapt. This serious omission limits the policy’s effectiveness in bringing about sustainable change in Canada’s race relations. One current concrete example of this is the implicit racism involved in the lack of acceptance of foreign credentials, which leads to economic and social alienation of immigrants (Moodley, 1983). In not accepting foreign credentials, as Augie Fleras and Jean Leonard Elliot point out, “a Catch-22 is constant: without Canadian experience, many cannot get certified even with extensive retraining; without a certificate, they cannot get the experience to secure employment or peer acceptance” (1999: 313). This has hard-felt impacts on new immigrants. According to the 2001 census, 65.8 % of recent immigrants were employed, compared to 81.8% among Canadian-born (Alexander, 2003: 28). At the same time, foreign-born visible minorities earn only 78 cents for every dollar earned by foreign-born non-visible minorities (Alexander, 2003: 29). Some immigrant groups, such as Indo-Pakistanis and South Americans, “experience levels of poverty that are twice the national average and that the second generation immigrants may be poorer than their parents, despite not having to face language and cultural obstacles” (Halli and Mohammad, cited in Fleras and Elliot, 1999: 278).

In the midst of this increasing disparity, there has also been a cut back of government spending targeted towards multiculturalism. While federal policies encourage programming to address multicultural issues, the funding available for these programs has been significantly reduced over the last few years even though immigration continues to rise. Leonie Sandercock calls this the fiscal crisis of multiculturalism (2005). In an era of increased need for immigrant services, such as education, housing and health, as well as programs to

counter discrimination, these areas are undergoing dramatic cuts from both provincial and federal levels of government.

What results from this deprioritization of multiculturalism is a shallow multiculturalism where diversity is paid lip service to but there is no fundamental redistribution of power in order to include immigrants in Canadian society (Fleras and Elliot, 1999: 138). In a study on mixed-race women's perceptions of the federal multicultural policy, the women described the policy as "an institutional project which funds and promotes staged ethnic representations" which do not reflect the daily realities of their lives (Mahtani, 2002: 74). Others similarly argue that the government is willing to support folk festivals and ethnic performing arts in an elaborate game of pretend pluralism, but is at the same time reluctant to support minority demands for collective rights or socioeconomic enhancement (Fleras and Elliot, 1999: 313). Diversity is celebrated while fundamental problems of discrimination and systemic racism are not addressed.

### *Provincial Government – British Columbia*

British Columbia's multicultural policies are largely restricted to the Multiculturalism Act (1996). The Act lays out broad purposes which have the potential of addressing the issue of building cross-cultural understanding. These are: to recognize that the diversity of British Columbians is a fundamental characteristic of our society, to encourage respect for the multicultural heritage of British Columbia, to promote racial harmony and cross-cultural understanding, and to foster full and free participation of all British Columbians in the economic, social, cultural and political life of the province (Province of British Columbia, 1996). The Act outlines several policies related to reducing racism and violence as well as increasing cross-cultural understanding. These

policies imply, but do not explicitly state, that the host society's beliefs and behaviours must be addressed in order to achieve the purposes of the Act.

### *Some Limitations of Provincial Policies*

Despite some of the Multiculturalism Act's progressive policies, the current government's lack of funding of programs which come under the Act seriously limits any impact this policy could have. For this Act to achieve its potential, the government would need to infuse it with funding and build strong partnerships with grass roots organizations able to implement innovative programs that can reach the Act's lofty goals. In addition, by restricting its multicultural policy to one Act, the province has failed to give municipalities a strong mandate to work on multicultural issues (Ley & Murphy, 2001). Without a clear mandate, municipalities have been hesitant to commit tax-payers' money to these issues. The province's new strategic framework, which was released in 2005, does outline some interesting directions for multiculturalism in B.C., such as asserting that the provincial government should sponsor multicultural and anti-racism training for community leaders (Province of British Columbia, 2005: 14). However, its central flaw is that nobody is mandated to do anything. In addition, at the municipal level, the focus is on creating multicultural celebrations. For example, suggestions for what municipalities could do include, "promote religious and cultural days of importance within the community to highlight local diversity" and "increase sponsorship for multicultural events in a variety of public spaces" (Province of British Columbia, 2005: 10). These directions do not engage at all with transformative, anti-racist approaches.

### *City of Vancouver Policies*

City of Vancouver Mission Statement: To create a great city of communities, which cares about its people, its environment, and the opportunities to live, work and prosper (City of Vancouver, 2006b).

Largely responding to federal and provincial policies and funding, the City of Vancouver has sought to develop local multiculturalism-oriented policies, initiatives, programs, and partnerships. In 1977 the City adopted the Equal Employment Opportunity program that outlined the policies and guidelines for hiring a diverse workforce and offered diversity training to City staff. In 1988, under Mayor Gordon Campbell, City Council adopted a civic policy on Multiculturalism Relations. The policy addresses the need to recognize diversity as strength, freedom from prejudice, and to ensure access to civic services for all residents regardless of backgrounds, including those who have language barriers (City of Vancouver, 2006c).

In response to this policy and the needs of an increasingly ethnically diverse population, the City undertook a variety of multicultural initiatives in the 1980s and 1990s. In 1989 the Hastings Institute was created in response to a growing demand from external organizations for the kind of diversity training the City was offering internally. In 1993, the City hosted community forums entitled "From Barriers to Bridges" during which Council reaffirmed its policy of reflecting cultural diversity in all aspects of civic activity. Two years later, Council adopted a Diversity Communications Strategy, developed by staff and community representatives that included a multilingual information and referral phone service as well as an ethnic media news monitoring service that provides overviews of key messages for staff (City of Vancouver, 2006d). The

City also keeps an inventory of staff people who speak a second language and who are on-call if language assistance is required.

The CityPlan process, beginning in 1993, was one of the largest public involvement processes undertaken by the City (City of Vancouver, 2006e). Between 1993 and 1995, CityPlan staff developed strategies to involve the cultural and immigrant groups in the City. As Joyce Lee pointed out in her 2002 Masters thesis *Visioning Diversity: Planning Vancouver's Multicultural Cities* which examined CityPlan, the City still has a long way to go in creating innovative processes that effectively engage diverse communities. However, outreach to these groups does continue to be an important part of the ongoing CityPlan Neighbourhood Visions process, and the City continues to learn and adapt its methods.

In 1994, a Special Advisory Committee on Diversity Issues was formed to advise Council on various policy-related issues concerning better inclusion and involvement of culturally diverse communities. Every year, the committee gives two categories of Cultural Harmony Awards: individual and organizational. In 1999, Council approved \$513, 600 or 18.5% of the City Grant program for community organizations that service immigrants/refugees or culturally distinct communities (City of Vancouver, 2006f). Priority for the funding has been given to services aimed at removing barriers to access of service for many members of ethnic communities and/or facilitating the integration of "newcomers." Examples of agencies receiving grants include MOSAIC, SUCCESS, Immigrant Services Society, and Metropolis Vancouver. Vancouver also publishes a Newcomer's Guide to the City, which is available in five languages. This variety of approaches has made Vancouver a leader, at least in municipalities within the Greater Vancouver metro-region, in multicultural readiness (Edgington and Hutton, 2002).

### *Limitations to Vancouver's Policies*

Although the City of Vancouver has certainly sought to develop multicultural initiatives to promote equality and understanding between diverse groups in the city, Ley and Murphy (2001) question whether their efforts have been consistent with the high level of immigration. Federal and provincial downloading of responsibilities have left municipalities to address multicultural, diversity and integration issues without additional resources. As with the provincial and federal governments, the City has much more to do to prepare both itself as a corporation and the host society within its boundaries to receive newcomers. The City's work is restricted due to the fact that funding from senior levels of government for multicultural initiatives has become increasingly scarce as well as the fact that municipalities in British Columbia have only a vague and optional mandate to work on multicultural issues (Ley & Murphy, 2001).

### FINDINGS

Having set the context for the work of the Hastings Institute/ EEO through the preceding discussion of multicultural policies, I now move on to a focused description and analysis of the Hastings Institute/ EEO. Many broad themes emerged throughout this research. As a way of structuring the broad array of data that was gathered, the information has been organized thematically to give a picture of the past, present and future of the Hastings Institute/ EEO as part of the City of Vancouver's larger multicultural work. You will also find that through the interviews, a focus emerged on "the Kingswood years" as the heyday of the organization as well as the benchmark against which all future work of the organization would be measured. As stated in a 1999 report to council:

The “Kingswood years” created a framework of knowledge, awareness and commitment in key areas throughout the province and are the foundation on which the Hastings Institute has built its current programs. (City of Vancouver, 1995: 4).

More space is, thus, given to a description and analysis of these early years as they provided the foundation upon which all future work of the Hastings Institute/ EEO was built.

### *Origins of the Hastings Institute*

In an analysis of how diversity policies originate in municipalities, a report prepared by the City of North Vancouver points out that cities such as Vancouver, Richmond and Burnaby, which were most affected by the wave of Asian immigration that began in the 1980s, were early proponents of policies to manage diversity. Vancouver has since taken its development of diversity and cross-cultural policies and mandates much further than other municipalities. In their analysis, the City of North Vancouver points out that the early and continuing adaptation of these policies by the City of Vancouver was greatly helped by having champions within the bureaucracy (City of North Vancouver: 2000: 49). Many interviewees suggested it was the initiative and support of the then mayor (Gordon Campbell), and the City Manager (Ken Dobell) that initially gave rise to the organization. The Hastings Institute was seen as such a priority that the mayor was installed as the chair of the board, something that continues to this day. Many felt the early commitment by senior staff was one of the key elements that secured long-term commitment to this kind of endeavour. A past trainer for the Hastings Institute felt that this was something that enabled Vancouver to maintain a commitment to this initiative:

Unless the city manager says it is a priority, or the mayor, then it really isn't a priority. You do have people at mid-management and they can do small things, but important things. But really you need people at the senior level to be saying this is significant to us. (Interviewee C)

During its initial three years of operation, the Hastings Institute received core funding from the Secretary of State – Multiculturalism and Citizenship Canada and financial support for program development from provincial ministries and agencies (City of Vancouver, 1995: 3). Many of the interviewees felt that this support, financial and otherwise, for the early training carried out by the Hastings Institute arose out of a unique environment. There was commitment to multicultural training during that time from all levels of government. This, however, waned after a few peak years. In describing an offshoot of the Kingswood simulation training aimed at Crown Corporations, which was nicknamed "the Crowns", one ex-Hastings trainer had this to say about how support for the program had tapered off:

The Crowns was a two-day training where a bunch of the Crowns came together – BC Hydro, BCBC, BC Transit, a mix of all of them. It was meant to be mostly supervisors. And we had one of the VPs who would always come and promote the training and that took place in a hotel in Richmond. This was the day when money flowed for training because we would have coffee, tea, muffins and then a fancy lunch... That was the standard. It was expected. That was a costly training. But they were up for it because at that time there definitely was commitment from the Crowns to look at this. They had equity offices and the provincial government was pushing equity... People can't pay for things anymore. The Crowns training we couldn't do anymore. Not with all that money for actors and lunches and people getting away for two days for diversity training in this climate. There has been a shift and that's related to

the fiscal climate, the political climate, and the fact that many organizations are so concerned with the bottom line that diversity has fallen off the table. (Interviewee H)

Many interviewees talked about how it was the spirit of the times that gave rise to the possibility of the organization and to the City's cross-cultural ambitions. It was a time in which there was, in the words of one former Kingswood trainer, "an amazing sense of possibility." A long-term trainer with the Hastings Institute had this to say about the ethos of the time:

In some ways the work that we were doing at Hastings was challenging organizations to reflect on what does it really mean to welcome and value diversity – we say it, but what does it mean to enact it in our organization. It was a very positive and challenging time. It was also a time where people were willing to have that dialogue. That's another reason why I appreciated being involved in that work because people were open to having conversations. Human rights law was in place but human rights jurisprudence was just coming into being. Past practices were being challenged that existed for years – that ethos was being challenged. The language that we used: firemen became fire officers; aldermen became councilors, etc. Not to say that all of these changes came easy. I would argue that it was more than the policy of the City. It was a changing ethos in Canadian society that began to challenge these practices and we just were involved in the education and training of this. (Interviewee A)

Some also cited the local political environment as particularly conducive to the emergence of the organization. A past trainee of the Hastings Institute who now heads up a local non-profit had this to say:

I think at that time Council had enough level of stability that they were able to try some new and innovative kinds of things. It was just after Expo [86] so there was some attention around the city being a world Mecca in some respects. I came from the prairies to Vancouver after Expo – the diversity of the city drew me here. Part of that may have been created through Expo and part of it may have been created by it being a diverse community at that time. My sense is that was when things really began to shift from the city’s perspective. And I think after Expo there were still a lot of residual effects. There was lots of development that happened – there was lots of housing development and Hong Kong’s time clock was ticking. So there were a number of things that were having huge influences in the community. I think the City had to react to that. Many people in our community were very resistant to these changes. They didn’t want their sleepy little community to become a big city. They didn’t want to have these strangers coming from other parts of the world and changing it. So I think that’s kind of what leads to a lot of things. And there were some good innovative things happening at that time. The children’s advocate was designated in that period, lots of interesting social housing was being developed. As far as the other levels of government I don’t remember the provincial government being very involved at that point. Everything that was really happening around inclusivity and diversity was really coming from the municipality. (Interviewee G)

### *Organizational Development*

Interviewees focused a lot of their discussion on how the organization had shifted, both positively and negatively, over time. This section will outline the changes they observed and the reasons for them.

### *The Kingswood Years*

The first, and, as stated above, to this day the best-known program carried out through the Hastings Institute/ EEO was the Kingswood Management Training Program. A quick summary of how it functioned was outlined in a 1995 report to council:

The fictitious City of Kingswood mimicked a civic bureaucracy; participants were drawn largely from government at the municipal and provincial levels and the program was specifically structured around their needs.(City of Vancouver, 1995: 3)

The foundation of the Kingswood program was experiential learning principles and training techniques such as role play and simulation. Trainees took on characters for the entire five days of training and were put through various scenarios. For instance, this is how one trainee described her experience:

we went away to Qualicum on the island and stayed in a hotel. When we arrived we were each given a character. I think that I was Wilma and I was the volunteer coordinator for some organization and then I had to play that role throughout the whole week and at certain times there were particular tasks that I was called upon to do. And then through the actual scenarios there were some learning and some debriefing afterwards with the whole group and discussions and how somebody would work on issues that we were faced with. I found it very good training in that it had some very hands-on experience but it also looked at policies, city directions and visions and began to not only make you think about what you needed on the ground but also what you needed to create in terms of a vision for yourselves in your community. One scenario I was put through where we had a volunteer and someone had complained because the volunteer was a person from another culture and had some very specific views about that individual and their capacity. And through that discussion and dialogue it was my role to both advocate for that individual but also do some education with that person and also to set some parameters on what we as an organization could do and not

do. We could not support his request to remove that person because we did not feel that it was substantiated and had to be diplomatic and not call that person a racist or whatever, but to kind of learn how to bring those issues forward in a way that I think created mutual respect and also modeled that. (Interviewee G)

These were well-funded, high-profile training sessions. One past trainer jokingly referred to it as “luxury level training” (Interviewee B). As luxurious as it was, the training was also intended to be challenging and hard-hitting. This past trainer went on to paint this picture of how Kingswood training looked:

...what would happen is that the white well-intentioned and quite comfortable bureaucrat is sitting up in the training room learning about employment equity policy and about the Charter and someone will come up from downstairs and tap them on the shoulder and say we have a situation in your department that we need to deal with. Well, he didn't know he actually had a department so he was shocked to find that out. They would follow you out and you'd take them into a room and sitting in that room is a young black woman who's been passed over for a promotion or has been harassed in the workplace and tells him the story and asks him what are you going to do about it? This is your fault, this is your department, you deal with it, you fix it, and you change it. The whole thing was designed, yes, around role plays but not around you pretend to be this or that. They got thrown into something. They had no idea it was like this whole underworld was there and all of the sudden it really was like a city down there. And she would say and it's that guy and you better talk to him. So he'd send off a memo saying that that person should be disciplined and all of the sudden there would be another person [saying] I'm bringing the union in how dare you say that. So it was very immediate, very hands on. Along with the information and the knowledge and the learning, but the thing was it was in their face all the time about 12 hours a day. It just went straight through. (Interviewee B)

Many pointed out that the ultimate purpose of Kingswood went beyond changing personal opinions to shaping the organizations and communities in

which city and other employees worked. One long-term trainer for the Hastings Institute/ EEO observed:

This is a very important point. The City provided the resources and we were able to put in place a training program so at the end of the day there would be changed policies and processes that ended up serving a wider population. It was a very creative and effective time. (Interviewee A)

One key way that Kingswood operated was to turn training into concrete action by incorporating plans for how participants would follow-up into the training. Participants created a contract which was an action plan for when they returned to their jobs, saying what they were going to do around specific things such as hiring practices and public outreach.

### *Approach to Training*

Those who had been involved in Kingswood as trainers or trainees felt that the program took a unique and innovative approach for its time. A past trainer's analysis of different approaches to training tells us a lot about the philosophical debates and underpinnings of their work at that time:

What we were trying to do was traverse the middle ground on this and we had lots of disagreements between us about what that was about. Kingswood was really going for an experiential piece that if people experienced it, had human to human relationships rather than just information that there was some interaction that really got you to think about what this all meant that this could really change your life. And so Hastings and the Kingswood model was a balance point around how does that best play out. And it was a very powerful piece... One of the things that Hastings was built on was hope and a belief in human beings and in their good. See some training is really based on human beings or parts of them as being of ill-intent or bad or evil. Hastings and the Kingswood model wasn't that way. It was really based on a belief that people could change, on a belief that

if people have the right experience and the right information and the right support, the Titanic will turn. (Interviewee B)

The impact assessment carried out on the Kingswood training in 1999 also underlines the balance that the training team was trying to create:

Members of the training team stressed that the program they deliver is active, experiential, designed to make participants think it is real and to operate at the "gut level." However a substantial amount of effort is put into information and content. Clearly it is not intended to be like an encounter group. The training team's objective is not just to engineer an emotional experience but to include a substantial amount of current information in a learning format that is exciting and challenging. The simulation is designed to take participants out of their real working lives and allow them the freedom to explore other ideas and ways of relating. It is demanding at several different levels: organizational, individual, small group. This is done to enhance the complexity of the training and underline the high expectations of involvement. (Berman and Levitan, 1990: 4)

### *Changes over Time*

Over the years, Hastings Institute training evolved from a five day residential to two day residential, then to non-residential. It first evolved into a mini-Kingswood program called "Valuing Diversity" which borrowed many techniques from Kingswood and was made more broadly available. Slowly, the focus began to shift from broad diversity or cross-cultural training to more of a focus on harassment prevention. In 1996, Hastings piloted a harassment intervention skills session. 1999 saw the creation of, and a shift in its primary focus to, a workshop titled "Working Towards a Harassment-free Workplace."

A content analysis of current training documents also shows a shift in training focus from the earlier immersive, experiential kind of training. Apart from the ongoing training of the Workplace Language Program, there are cur-

rently two key one-day training sessions: Workplace Harassment Prevention and Harassment Intervention Skills. As indicated by the titles, the focus of these training sessions is on more overt manifestations of discriminatory behaviour rather than the systemic, underlying causes of discrimination such as societal power structures and colonial history. Part of the focus of the training is, thus, on legal frameworks which guide workplace conduct. For instance, an exercise in the first day of training, "the Harassment Game" focuses on identifying which of a number of scenarios were legally considered harassment. In the first session, there are a couple of video exercises which show people being discriminated against. The aim of these is to elicit reactions as to how one would deal with this situation in the workplace. This is the closest that trainees come to role playing or experiential learning in the first session.

The second session, "Harassment Intervention Skills," is meant as further skill development for supervisors only. This second day begins as a follow-up for supervisors after a 4 to 6 week period. The focus of this day is, therefore, less on outlining examples and legal definitions of harassment than the first day. For instance, participants talk about injustice and why it is that "we often don't intervene or speak up when we see an injustice occurring" (City of Vancouver, 2005). There are also brief role plays in which each participant gets a chance to take on the role of the harasser, the harassed and the intervening supervisor. Participants also take a look at Action Plans that they created after their first day of training and reflect on how they have or have not been able to enact theirs. Thus, some experiential elements from the original Kingswood training are still there in the second training day, though to a much lesser degree than they were in the original training. In addition, rather than being broadly available, these training sessions are for returning supervisors only.

### *Why the Shift in Training Occurred*

Interviewees offered many explanations as to why such a dramatic shift in training had occurred from Kingswood's residential, experiential, multi-day approach to the current shorter sessions focused largely on harassment prevention and intervention. One ex-trainer who worked for the organization towards the end of the Kingswood programs had this to say about the shift in training:

Kingswood was a very effective model. Most people would say that it was very valuable and meaningful to them. The downfall of Kingswood was there was no way to build some sustainability when people went back to their organizations. They had this incredible experience at Kingswood and then they went back to their jobs and very little changed because these people were not necessarily empowered to change or given the time to facilitate change. The other element of that is that it is a very costly program. You have a big human resource component to it... They require whatever time release, etc. Plus the staffing model of the trainers was very expensive. While I am very much a supporter of simulation, a five day simulation is not cost-effective especially when you consider the first point I made about having support when they go back to the organization. But the other thing is that Kingswood didn't in a way present solutions or strategies. It presented a real learning in terms of awareness. And you could develop strategies because a lot of things you did in the simulations focused on developing strategies but those weren't necessarily things which you could say, "okay take this strategy you can use it back in your organization." So while you did learn strategies there wasn't necessarily a link as to how to apply that when you got back into your organization. And it might not have been necessarily a strategy going on in the organization. People did learn a lot about exclusion, harassment, all those kinds of things and I think it did change people's behaviour per se but it didn't change organizations so much. It might change the kind of environment that people were in because certain behaviour did change. I think that did assist. But I think also it maybe had run its course. Its time had come and people needed to move on to something different. And I think some of those differences were to become more organization-

ally focused in a very specific way. That would be my impression whether that's training people within the organizations to do that kind of facilitation or being change agents within their group or whether it was to begin to work on some specific organizational initiatives like policy and policy implementation and strategic planning and so on. I think overall in the scheme of diversity and multiculturalism there has been that shift generally from more of that kind of generalized training to something that's very specifically focused to help organizations do a specific task or become more inclusive in a particular way. So I think it might have been kind of an evolution process for some of it. And also it wouldn't be funded anymore. It was just not something that people would fund so much anymore. (Interviewee C)

A current trainer for the Hastings Institute/ EEO asserted that training had evolved as a result of a widespread feeling that the original diversity training had been saturated in the organization. She observed that the focus had needed to move from awareness to skills building:

I think there was a sense that diversity training had really been saturated in the organization. That we could realize that from the number of people who were enrolling or not enrolling in the programs... There's only so many ways that you can do awareness training. The thing that is important about the harassment prevention and intervention is that it is very skills-based. And that's what people need. They need skills. When you are looking at diversity issues there is a real challenge in building skills. You can do a lot with awareness [raising], with sensitivity, with developing empathy and understanding and giving knowledge and information, challenging biases but it is a challenge to figure out how you build skill around that, and so I agreed with the shift to something that would focus on skills building. Because after all you cannot require people to change their attitudes – you can only educate slowly and people will arrive at their own understandings over some period of time. But you can require certain behaviors in terms of a respectful workplace and you can develop skills for supervisors around how to foster that. And so I really supported that shift. (Interviewee F)

There was also a realization that, overall, people's general level of awareness had shifted from the eighties, when Hastings was established, to now.

A long term trainer for the organization described how he had seen training change accordingly:

Whereas I think about ten years ago doing this kind of training there was more of a requirement to say these are the basics – workplace cultures have changed, we can't do this anymore. Well, people generally know that now. They know that you can't make racist jokes, they know that you can't have pinups. Whereas we can't say ten years ago that that was just generally known and generally accepted. So now we spend a lot more time on the subtler kinds of issues and I think that that is a kind of reflection that people have responded to and taken in an understanding of what the basic requirements are for how we treat each other in the workplace. It's that shift in the nature of the questions to questions that show that people are focusing on areas that may be more subtle or more grey. (Interviewee A)

Some interviewees felt it was these feelings of diversity training saturation, coupled with lowered budgets and a more wide-spread diversity awareness, that gave the impetus to switch to shorter-term training focused on delivering specific information and skills.

However, interviewees had differing perceptions of the change of the organization from the early years of Kingswood. While some saw it as outlined above, as a natural evolution given the changing climate, others saw it as a result of poor policy decisions and a shift in priorities. A number of interviewees cited the attempt in the early 1990s to turn the organization into a revenue generating company as an example of this shift in priorities. In 1992, three years after its creation, the Hastings Institute underwent an expansion which was shaped around the idea that the organization could generate revenue as a private company, quite separate from the EEO. It moved its offices and grew to more than a dozen staff, mostly trainers. These trainers were paid salaries by the City, but were expected to bring in private training contracts from outside sources such as other levels of government, and private

sector business (Interviewees C and H). This was a brief experiment, and the Hastings Institute laid off many staff in 1994 and once again became more closely linked with the EEO. According to a 1995 memorandum titled *Proposed 1995 Operating Structure of the Hastings Institute*:

In July, 1994, the Institute informed City Council of the financial difficulties it was experiencing and that a deficit of \$136,737 had incurred as of June 21, 1994... Several budget reduction measures were initiated in an attempt to reduce the deficit. Two support staff positions were phased out. A third support staff position was terminated on November 30th. All salary consultant positions have been changed to project based contracts... Anticipating a deficit of \$200,000 by the end of this calendar year, the Institute cannot afford to take any additional financial risk next year. The only alternative is to downsize it into a very small organization, merge with the EEO, with no infrastructure or overhead support and maintain minimal activity to slowly repay the deficit loan. (City of Vancouver, 1995: 2-4)

The Hastings Institute, thus, downsized dramatically, becoming an organization with fewer staff and less programming. Financial records showing the changes in funding over time for the Institute are not publicly available. However, there was general agreement among interviewees that funding for the Institute's work from the City had shrunk considerably since its expansion in 1992 and subsequent downsizing in 1994. It should be noted here that the funding of the EEO, however, whose staffing levels have stayed relatively constant over the past 20 years, has remained stable (Interviewee L).

As mentioned above, some interviewees felt that these shifts in the Hastings Institute were the result of poor planning or a shift in priorities. One ex-trainer had this to say about what she saw as the failed corporatization of the organization:

You could have misread the climate. You could have misread that this was something that could develop into kind of a corporate effort separate from

the City. But I think it might have been a little bit of wishful thinking. There was a lot of dough, there was a lot of people working there as staff. We were all earning pretty good money and getting a lot of work. But people had to have the money to pay for training and that money did not stay at those levels. It's sustained in the sense that some of that is still going on but on such a smaller scale. A much smaller scale. And I am still making a living at it although there has been a shift; I don't do as much diversity training anymore because few are paying for it. So I am primarily focusing on... you know, still working on systemic change but from a different angle mostly focusing on addressing issues of access for internationally trained professionals. So the shift is because that's where there is energy and money. And I don't know if at the time whether there could have been a broadening of the scope but maybe that just was not possible. (Interviewee H)

One ex-trainer suggested that the decision to expand the Hastings Institute and experiment with revenue generation was not philosophically compatible with the staff at the time:

It was really the, then, City Manager and Assistant City Manager [names excluded] who were kind of the managers of that process. And they were the ones who made this decision for revenue generation to take place. And I think there is still probably hard feelings about that. People felt like they had been brought in to do one thing and it turned out to be another. And they weren't necessarily incompatible, but there were some value conflicts that needed to be examined and they weren't examined as such... I think when you are getting into revenue generation...[you have] a particular vision of the way you think the organization is going, that has, in a sense, capitalist values attached to it. And many of us don't (well sure, we are all capitalists to some degree – we make money we try to own houses and cars) but many of us would go on the other side of that to believing that it is about working for social justice and coming from a socialist agenda and less of a money making agenda. (Interviewee C)

One early Kingswood trainer who ceased to work for the organization as it changed felt the City had chosen to pursue different objectives:

I believe primarily there was a large shift in priorities. If there was a political thing about flavour of the year it was done. On their behalf, it may be that without the funding it wasn't going to be possible to do this kind of stuff. But it looked deeper than that. Because it looked to me – and by this time I was an outsider – it didn't look to me as though there was an attempt to reestablish a set of priorities for the next stage. I mean I'm sure they would say that that is what they have done is work directly with departments and so on. The pull back was so fast except for areas around language training... but the pullback felt so quick that it looked like it was "okay we are done here. Pull the troops back we are out of here." So that people were still there and working in those departments but what they were doing, I haven't seen outcome. I haven't seen huge policy change. I haven't seen them working by going into departments and saying how can we help you with the hiring piece. They may well be doing that but it is certainly not on a large enough scale that it would be visible to someone like me, at least. Cause I am on the outside but not totally on the outside – the world of this kind of training is quite small. So, yes, I would say reprioritizing, just a pull back. (Interviewee B)

There were, thus, a complex range of societal, financial and political factors at play which interviewees felt influenced the shift in the Hastings Institute at this time. While interviewees had differing points of view about the main drivers of this shift, they all agreed that dramatic changes took place in the nature of the organization and the training it carried out. This discussion will be picked up in the following section regarding the current incarnation of the organization.

### *Current Incarnation and Current Environment*

Interviews expressed a range of opinions about the current incarnation of the Hastings Institute/ EEO. Many felt that there is a lack of public profile for the organization right now. One interviewee, a past trainer, observed that "they

are a shadow of their former selves. People think they don't exist anymore" (Interviewee B). A past trainee similarly commented:

It was shocking when I heard the other day that the Hastings Institute was still around. It just has a very low profile. And I also think that the City is in a much different place than it was in 1980. What was interesting in that time was that not only was the training happening but also governments and funders were taking on different ways of getting people to multiculturalize their organizations and they did that primarily by using funding as the tool and so if you were reaching multicultural populations you would be higher priority for receiving funding under certain pools and those kind of encouragements and policies really moved a lot of organizations. (Interviewee G)

There were many ways in which interviewees felt that the current work of the organization did not go far enough. Both the ethos of the time as well as a shift in funding priorities (as mentioned in the above quote) were seen as the reason for the decline in programming. One ex-Hastings trainer painted this portrait of the current funding climate:

There is a little bit of anti-racism money coming out of the province, but it is a shadow of its former self... Neither Heritage [Canada] nor MCAWS [the Ministry of Community, Aboriginal, and Women's Services] have many resources... So the money's not there. Heritage has cut what it pays for and they have to be so accountable for every cent that it is like a pain in the neck to go for the money. Sometimes you just get tired. And Heritage said they wouldn't pay for any train-the-trainers anymore because they felt that they had been there, done that. Again people's priorities changed in terms of foundations and federal government what they want to see in place. How they want their money to be spent... It was a big vision and it was brilliant while it lasted but it couldn't have been sustained. (Interviewee H)

Another long-term trainer with the Hastings Institute/ EEO felt that the current societal climate was at the root of the shift:

To some extent what has happened – we've hit a... not a wall but a plateau – some people say there is kind of a backlash. I don't know if I would use

the word backlash. But more of a reflection. An example that I used in some of the training I do – it harkens back to the time that I was going to school in Vancouver. Currently my son is in the same school. During the December period there was a Christmas concert – I am Christian... I look at my son's concert – it's very diverse and multicultural. But people are looking back and asking, "have we lost something?" And I think that is where the plateau happens. I think we are being re-challenged. (Interviewee A)

## IMPACTS OF HASTINGS INSTITUTE/ EEO TRAINING

Despite their differing opinions about the current incarnation of the organization, all of the interviewees spoke highly about the impact that the training carried out by the organization had had over time. One of the authors of a 1990 impact assessment of early Kingswood training had this to say about her findings:

People who we interviewed talked about transformation as a result of Kingswood. There was a lot of words like that... I think that in the immediate sense Kingswood was incredibly impactful and probably I would say that in a deep emotional way it got people in the gut. We are talking intense. And you create a sense of uncertainty for people who work in a world where they are in control and certain of outcomes. They are the ones running the show. The positive feedback we got (we didn't get all positive because for some of the people it was very negative, they didn't feel safe, particularly the women, and that wasn't good because the Kingswood facilitators did not adequately address that according to them.) But for the deputy chief of police and the fire chief it opened their eyes in a very dramatic way. (Interviewee H)

The impact study outlined the specific elements of the training that trainees felt were most impactful, such as the simulation experience, the harassment scenarios and the panels from specific communities such as the disabled. Using information gathered from focus groups, questionnaires and interviews, the report outlined that:

For a majority of participants the simulation model was the key element in the success of Kingswood as a training program. The simulation models provided a context in which participants could challenge themselves and take risks as a means to enhancing their learning experience (Berman and Levitan, 1990: ii)

Of particular interest in this report is the fact that participants felt that the length of the training was appropriate (Berman and Levitan, 1990: 19).

In fact,

A clear majority thought it was the most cost efficient training program in this area. Although there was agreement that the program is expensive, participants felt the cost of not running the program would be higher (Berman and Levitan, 1990: 46).

Despite this, training was shortened in the following years, suggesting that the decision to do so may have been based on budgetary restrictions rather than on the actual needs of effective training.

The report further highlights the impact that the training had through discussing the way trainees felt upon returning to their workplace:

On returning to work participants reported recognizable changes in their individual perceptions. These ranged from personal changes in attitude and perspective regarding equity issues to a significant emphasis on the urgency of implementing equity in the workplace... All spoke of a clear commitment to take on a more proactive role with regard to equity issues in their departments and/ or organizations. An indicator of greater "equity consciousness" was an increased awareness of incidents of discrimination in their organization. In addition, a majority of interviewees remarked that they became more concerned with organizational policies and practice regarding the physically handicapped, ethnic minorities, and women. (Berman and Levitan 1990: 34).

One of the interviewees for my research, who had been a trainer for Kingswood, gave a specific example of how one high-ranking government em-

ployee transformed his ministry after the training he received, expanding the impact from the personal to a policy level:

there was one fellow who I will call John who's quite high up in [the Ministry of] Forestry for the province. He came to the training and he was one of the people who was really a guiding light out of that because he went back into his ministry and I always felt that he stood and looked at it with new eyes. He started creating programs – he created trainings up in the interior. I actually took part in some of them... But it wasn't the training as much as the way he changed policy and the way he put in programming that was different. He started doing pieces with aboriginal firefighter units that hadn't been done like that before. He started hiring things that were different. So what can come out of that piece is a bit of the scales falling off your eyes. (Interviewee B)

A series of interviews carried out by BCIT students in 1992 with trainees from City of Vancouver departments as diverse as engineering, finance, health, planning and parks also highlights many specific impacts of the training they had received from the Hastings Institute/ EEO. Many mention the emotional impact that the training had on them and how it has affected their point of view and actions since. One interview summary from an employee from the engineering department states that in the past, the interviewee

would have run away and ignored a case of sexual harassment. After going through Kingswood she had learned about her responsibility as an employer to deal with and correct the situation. (Mackinnon, Saucier, and Woodland, 1992: no page number)

Another interviewee from the Housing and Properties Department felt that the majority of the education of Kingswood has passed through him to the supervisors he manages. Before [interviewee's name]'s attendance at Kingswood in 1987, his department had complaints of human rights abuses and discriminatory practices based on race or disability. Since then, there

have been no complaints of discrimination. (Mackinnon et al, 1992: no page number)

As another example of the impacts documented through this report, an account from an interviewee in the planning department gives a specific story regarding how he has felt more able to take on discriminatory behaviour:

In past public meetings, there have been comments about monster houses being built. Comments like 'it's the people from Hong Kong that is [sic] causing all this.' It's the Asian immigration. Our immigration should not allow these people in. They are destroying our neighbourhoods.' [interviewee's name] has taken these people to task saying, 'Those people have nothing to do with the issue. Most of the monsters have been built on spec and not for a particular client. You can not blame them for bringing the monster houses into the neighbourhood. It's the spec builder who has done it. And that type of racial comment is unacceptable.' (Mackinnon et al, 1992: no page number)

In one of my own interviews, a past trainer for the Hastings Institute/ EEO outlined specific changes in the library system that occurred in the period after the training began:

I can remember working with the public library system. I'm not suggesting that the training should take all the credit for this – it was a piece of a larger shift. But if you look at the Vancouver public library system now – you go to any branch there is an elaborate selection of materials representing a number of backgrounds and in languages other than English. Looking back 10 or 20 years ago that was not the case. So I like to think that the training that was done in the early 90s had some impact into the kinds of services they offer and how they provide those services. (Interviewee A)

Other programs of the Hastings Institute/ EEO, apart from diversity training, were also highlighted by interviewees as having a positive impact. A past trainee of the Workplace Language Program who went on to be a trainer for the program felt that that contextual literacy program had really helped her and others:

...going to class at the beginning I didn't really like it because it's something different. Because some people just like me – I am not an open person. I didn't really want to share with a group of strangers. But once you get to know each other you get more open and you have the confidence to share. I think that is very important when you can have a group of people talking together to share experience and it is safe in a way. This is very important it is safe. You don't have to worry that it will spread everywhere. So I think most of the city employees have a similar situation. When they work, they work and they didn't have much time to talk with their co-workers. So once they come to the class they have opportunities... When you go back you be a happier person... And we see promotion after people come to our programs. They get opportunities. For instance a person could be working as a clerical worker because she had no opportunity to take notes because in her job that is not a requirement. So within the class she could just take minutes and then she had the experience so it's a little bit helping her when she gets the promotion later on. I think the city is changing quite a bit now. When I first got into the city almost all those department heads are males. So you can see now there are some women who are getting the higher positions and you can see that it is different groups. You can see the last name and you know that there are from different groups not just Caucasian. I think the city is changing in a good way. (Interviewee E)

She also had this story about one employee who experienced quite a shift from participating in the program:

One of the students who came to our class he was very quiet. He wrote about the sprinkler system at the beginning. After he left our program he became a lot more outgoing. He came several times and after he set up a chi gong class for all city employees where they can go. In his group I think he has over a hundred employees... He's been doing that for years now. Quite interesting because he says if he had never been to the class he never would have done that. (Interviewee E)

*Elements of Good Training and  
Other Approaches to Creating Change*

Throughout the interviews, trainers and trainees alike highlighted many of the elements of effective training and other approaches to creating change. I will now turn to a discussion of some of the key elements that they brought up.

*Ongoing Impact*

The importance of training not being a one-off but, rather, being part of a longer-term initiative was stressed by many interviewees. One past trainer for the Hastings Institute commented:

You need some kind of ongoing mechanism to keep the issue on the table, to keep it alive for people, to keep reminding themselves about what they have learned and how they can maintain that learning and how they can share that in their organizations... If you look at training alone you are going to see positive impacts after training generally speaking. People come up with new insights about themselves and about the issues and understanding of people's context and their organization and willingness to do something. Over the long term [with Hastings] I think there are people who sustain that and were helped by the resources that were there. But when those resources don't exist anymore, then I just don't know. I hope that it wasn't a meaningless exercise [and] that that shift can be sustained. But I think you've got to work at it. Particularly in organizations that are in survival mode and not willing to give it the time of day. Because I'm not sure we have moved to place where people truly understand that issues of diversity are about all that you do in the organization not just something off the side of your desk or some extra you have to get funding for. (Interviewee H)

Many interviewees stressed the importance of follow-up to training. One past Hastings Institute trainer who went on to work for a number of different private and public sector clients summed it up in this way:

Training has its pitfalls because it is invariably something between a rifle and a shotgun. It's got one load in it. One of the oil and gas companies [I work with] – they instituted hiring teams so that everyone had to be on the hiring team for their co-worker. If you can go in and do ongoing work with that hiring team you can change a lot of stuff... Invariably what we've learned is that training without follow up [is not effective]. And the follow up needs to be over time, over levels of experience, involve different components of practical and emotional and spiritual and actual intellectual shift because humans can't do a one time over and then salvation. For the most part people don't like change, don't want change and fight it. (Interviewee B)

A current trainer with the Hastings Institute outlined that the atmosphere in which training occurs was also very important to its impact:

Training that gets parachuted in a vacuum where there isn't policy support and not consistent messaging from senior management does not, in my experience, have the kind of impact that we would like it to have. Training within the environment of the City [of Vancouver] where there are consistent messages from the council members, the senior management, and the planning department... diversity is just embedded and integrated and infused in the way the City does business and I think training in that kind of environment is very effective. (Interviewee F)

Interviewees generally stressed the importance of longer range rather than one-off approaches to change. Types of longer range initiatives that were suggested included continual check in with the organization that has received training, including follow-up sessions where they can discuss issues which have arisen. A second suggestion was to facilitate the set up of committees with regular meetings whose role is to look at all aspects of their organization from a diversity lens. Also discussed was the idea that diversity shouldn't just

be put on one person's plate in an organization. A past trainee had this to say about the importance of having ongoing, long-term avenues from which to look at issues of diversity in her organization:

There isn't a day goes by that we aren't working on those issues. We just recently started a homeless showering program and we are having the same level of challenges as we did working with our culturally diverse community [which] is just getting people to the place where they get comfortable establishing human relationships with people that they may have seen very differently before. And our communities are constantly transient – we have new people coming and going. For people who may be living in a very diverse community their sensitivity might be very different than someone that comes from something that is a bit more homogeneous. I really do think that having something that is sustainable and ongoing and continues to build on capacity so it doesn't start from a place where people have no knowledge but recognize that knowledge changes and the communities grow and change and the kinds of support will change with that. (Interviewee G)

### *The Co-learning Approach*

Co-learning was seen by many to be an effective way of getting people to learn with, not at the expense of, others. One trainee of the Hastings Institute looked to the importance of more informal co-learning, where cultures were able to interact through contributing to their community through the arts:

I think around race relations... some of the things that we have really found to be extremely beneficial is when we can create environments where people are given the opportunity to contribute their skills and their knowledge. There is a focus on the assets rather than the needs so that there is a shift of thinking. Part of this goes along with the shift of community development thinking around not being necessarily needs based but to balance that with the assets in communities. And I know that that was a huge shift in our organizational development that we, for many years, saw our role as being able to provide services – English language services, services around interpretation and translation. Not that we don't continue to see that as our role

but we also recognize that we need to do a lot more attitudinally around our changes in attitude in order to create an environment that is open to other people contributing. One of my greatest examples is when we did the aboriginal carving out here at the neighbourhood house and it was an initiative that came from the aboriginal community that they wanted to do a carving and wanted us to help to get that happening. And we were very excited to do that. In my discussions with them I had talked about how it would be really nice for them to create what they were creating in a more public venue so that people in the community could actually see the creation. So as people got engaged in that process – they carved it out here [in front of the neighbourhood house] – there was lots of traffic. People would stop and see maybe some similarities between the work the aboriginals were doing and their culture. We had people who were Japanese saying this is very similar to how we carve and animistic belief systems got shared. It was just very powerful in that way. From the community perspective that project alone really shifted people's attitudes to see the aboriginal community as not so much a community that really needed child protection, addiction services, all kinds of social housing support but they saw the aboriginal community as just an extremely talented and thoughtful and creative people and the work that they did contributed to our community substantially both in building positive relations but also in beautifying our community with those beautiful carvings. And that's the kind of shifts around policy and activity and how we are approaching things that are much different. So not just seeing ourselves as providing service but that it has to be a whole atmosphere and environment that encourages inclusivity and contribution. So there's both a receiving and giving aspect. (Interviewee G)

One current trainer with the Hastings Institute/ EEO talked about the importance of creating atmospheres in training sessions which were conducive to co-learning because people were able to learn much more effectively from each other than from abstract examples:

I had another situation where there was an African-Canadian woman in the group... we were looking at issues of what does stereotyping mean and we looked at the diversity wheel and we had said what assumptions do we make about these characteristics. When we see an individual that looks like

this, what do we assume about their education, their marital status, their employment opportunities. And it was amazing that we were able to come up with the same kind of immediate assumptions. So as we explored this, a woman in the room said, "you know I have this experience when I go shopping in stores where I am followed and I am stalked and people want to look in my bags. And this doesn't just happen once. It happens over and over." And her co-workers just said, "we can't imagine this. It never occurred to us." And it was much more powerful than some theoretical example that I would give or some statistic that I would give on racial profiling. So I would say that it is the stories that people in the sessions tell that have the impact on others in the room. And that's when I know there's a shift. If I can create the environment where people will share genuinely what their own experiences are. We've had a number of occasions at the City doing this kind of training where someone will say, "Oh yes I had this experience" and then others in the room will say, "Well what did you do? Didn't anyone step up to support you?" And this is great because we are talking about bystanders who don't do anything and now they are horrified that no one stood up to be on this person's side. (Interviewee F)

The Workplace Language Program was also highlighted as offering an interesting approach to this kind of co-learning. This is what a trainer for that program had to say about the program:

It's not really ESL... It's really around language and around the idea that most of us when we meet each other we talk about stories. By telling stories we can make connections with people. So in the City of Vancouver there are people from all over and also people who are born here. So when they come to a class they are asked to write. It's a psycho-linguistic methodology. It's based on contextual literacy. Meaning that people write and what they write becomes the exercise. Whatever they put down on the paper that's what we look at. We look at the structure of the grammar and the mechanics, punctuation, spelling. So people are asked to write. Then they are asked to share their writing around the table. So it's quite multicultural because people come from all kinds of backgrounds and what they write is, in many cases, around their family. They write about family, children at school, about job issues and then they share that stuff around the table. It's confidential.

In doing so they are exposed to other people's cultures, other people's belief systems and the way other people see the world. I personally think that it's an ideal way to learn of other people's lives and if you can learn around other people's lives I believe that you can make connections... It's pretty simple and we very seldom do it. (Interviewee D)

### *Evolution over Time*

Another key aspect of good training that many interviewees talked about was the need of training to change as the needs of communities changed and evolved over time. One past Hastings Institute trainer pointed out:

I think that the evolution of the training – there's a mirroring of the inside and the outside. The communities change and evolve. The inside has to evolve and then the training has to evolve to meet the needs of how the inside has evolved and how the community has evolved. Because we are into so many more of the visibly different communities we are into second and third generations. So the experience of a second or third generation youth is totally different. We are coming on to forty years from when the act went through – the change in the immigration act. For a long time we acted as though this was something that would pass and Hastings was really about "it ain't going to pass so let's get down to it." At this point in this city nobody in their right mind has any expectation of it passing. It's a reality of everyone's life. People sometimes still ask for the cookbook – tell us how to deal with them. But that was another thing that Hastings was about – that there is no cookbook so let's get down to what is actually going on here. (Interviewee B)

This trainer had a specific example of how she had seen an evolution in a group she did training with over a number of years:

And I know from the police – these guys who are ready to retire who I worked with 10 or 15 years ago. During those years it was a really struggle time but they would have been young sergeants. And it was like, "we have to have our sense of humour, don't mess with our sense of humour"... And then a couple of years later I met a few of them for coffee and they said the weirdest damn thing happened. About three of them had gone down from

the Vancouver department to the Canadian police college in Ottawa – so there are police there from all over Canada doing higher level training. And they said that about the second night there they went out to the pub for a drink and as the night went on, I guess the conversation got a little rough around the edges and they said at one point they looked at each other and they had all pulled themselves back from the circle and were sitting there looking back and forth going “holy shit these people are really saying this.” And then they said to each other, “what happened to us? That was us.” But at this point it was so foreign and offensive and yet that had been where their own brotherhood was. But that shift occurred to the point where people don’t talk like that here. (Interviewee B)

It was as a result of these kinds of shifts that interviewees felt that training needed to evolve over time.

### *Looking Ahead: Suggestions for Improvement*

In addition to detailing the past successes and struggles of the Hastings Institute/ EEO, interviewees had a number of suggestions regarding how the City of Vancouver could become more effective in its training and diversity initiatives in general. As training at the City changed over the years, some felt that it lost some of its initial transformative learning-style focus and impact. For instance, some interviewees felt that the City’s approach to diversity had to reinstate a more systemic approach. One past Hastings Institute trainer commented:

I personally think that in all organizations (and Hastings I believe has worked towards this philosophy at least initially), that it is everybody’s business not just the EEO’s, that it is every manager’s, every front line worker’s... everybody is responsible for creating an inclusive environment. And I think they still hold to that. So that has to be pushed within the organization and people need to be held more accountable. Like performance evaluations need to be tied in – are managers measuring that as a competency? Is it a skill that people are required to have? I’m not sure how systemic it is.

I think that they [Hastings's employees] do good work, they sit on a lot of committees and bring the issue up and with this council... But [do they work] systemically? (Interviewee H)

Interviewees also felt that the City, and other organizations, did not do enough to address the systemic barriers to employment faced by immigrants. One past trainer for the Hastings Institute had this to say on the subject:

I don't believe that mainstream organizations are doing enough. It's like, here I am working with regulatory organizations and it's a surprise to them that they have some responsibility to address this issue... For some of them it's like a wake up call when you tell them that they are liable because of the Charter. I mean, today, you wouldn't expect that I would be saying that about an organization. So we have a long way to go. We still are putting the responsibility on immigrants to get the skills that match Canadian standards as if these ethnocentric standards are superior. We are still stuck. And it's heartbreaking when you see the impact of that. (Interviewee H)

Many interviewees felt that the Hastings Institute/ EEO had to look beyond training initiatives to other cross-cultural initiatives. A few looked back to a past initiative undertaken by the City – the Barriers to Bridges community dialogue – as the kind of thing they would like to see the City undertake once again. One past Hastings Institute trainer had this to say:

If the question is, "is the Hastings model an effective way of dealing with this?" I really don't think so. I don't think it does enough. I think what they do is fine. I just don't think it is enough... There was a very successful project a long time ago – probably 10 or 12 years ago called Barriers to Bridges. And it was a community dialogue. They had these dialogues in community centers and people met in various community centers in the city of Vancouver... And it was just getting people to talk about living in diverse communities. And one of the things that they did was to get new immigrants to talk about the immigrant experience. Sharing their stories and trying to use that to facilitate community awareness and understanding of the issues that we face. That kind of community building is very useful in these kinds

of diverse communities. And also doing them in places like Dunbar where people don't think it's very diverse but then you have all these ethnic groups and cultural communities come out and you go "oh, it is diverse"... Those kind of things could be partnered in terms of Hasting is working on a part of it and EEO is working an element... And then you got other people in planning or social planning who are working on elements of it. Make it a multi-layered, multi-level City initiative. (Interviewee C)

Many interviewees mentioned that they would like to see more diversity at the City as well as at the Hastings Institute/ EEO itself. A current trainer for the Hastings Institute/ EEO commented:

I would like to see different people involved. I would like to see for Hastings to bring in some of the people who have been through the training doing some more training. Cause sometimes what happens is that it seems like the Caucasian middle class takes over stuff and that's kind of how it is. But it doesn't have to be that way. There can be other trainers and not just based on the fact that they happen to be from one group or another but I mean there are people out there with merit and I think that being true, you also need to waive so called academic and formal learning to bring people in. (Interviewee D)

Along with suggestions for how the City could expand its programming and impact, most of the interviewees felt that more funding should be designated from all three levels of government towards these kinds of initiatives. One trainer also stressed that training could not be impactful unless funding was provided to do "upfront work" to see what kind of training was needed:

We gotta find some middle ground where we can actually do that upfront work to determine what kind of change practices, behaviors, will be required. It would be nice to get back to that kind of environment where resources were provided for that. (Interviewee H)

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In order to bring the myriad of comments and suggestions provided through the interviews and document analysis together, I will spend a few paragraphs outlining the central findings that emerged from this research. It was agreed that the Hastings Institute emerged at a special time in terms of commitment to multiculturalism by local government and broader society. Vancouver emerged at this time as a leader in multicultural programming and training and the Hastings Institute enjoyed a high profile as a key driver of this innovation. Unlike many other municipalities, the City of Vancouver has shown a long-term commitment to diversity programming and training, despite the apparent lack of public profile of the current incarnation of the Hastings Institute/ EEO.

### *Shifts over Time*

Key themes regarding the evolution of the Hastings Institute/ EEO's work over time were that the organization's approach to training had shifted through the years due to external factors such as funding, changing government priorities, changes in societal support for diversity issues, and the need to advance to a focus on the development of specific skills rather than on general awareness building. Many highlighted the failed attempt at developing the Hastings Institute using a business model as a shifting point for the organization's role and status. A few key contradictions developed in interviewees' discussions of the evolution of the organization. For instance, while many felt that there was a need to evolve the training, it was also felt that some important elements of the early Kingswood training had been lost.

### *Elements of Good Training and Other Approaches to Change*

Interviewees outlined many positive impacts that the training had on them and others. In discussions of training, role playing and experiential learning were identified as the most effective elements of the early Kingswood training. However, it was also pointed out that these elements are largely not part of the current training. Additional elements of effective training that were identified by interviewees included the idea that training could not be a one-off, that effective follow-up had to be done as part of training, that co-learning was key, and, finally, that self-reflection by trainers was essential.

### *Current Environment and Suggestions for Improvement*

Overall, it was felt that there was a certain lack of leadership and innovation by the City compared with the past. Interviewees had a number of recommendations for future directions the City could take to improve upon their multicultural work. Many felt that the City needed to refocus its diversity training on the more transformative approaches which were a central feature of Kingswood training. Also, the idea that the City needed to focus not only on training of individuals but on more systemic transformation of organizations emerged. It was felt that the City needed to make more efforts to have its own staff reflect the true diversity of Vancouver residents. A related point was the idea that all levels of government had much more to do in terms of reducing barriers to employment currently faced by new immigrants. Many also outlined the need for community dialogues, such as the City's earlier Barriers to Bridges dialogues, and other community level initiatives, focused on diversity.

Finally, it was widely felt that all three levels of government had to make a stronger commitment to multicultural initiatives.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The Hastings Institute/ EEO represents an innovative step taken by a local government to begin to engage its inhabitants, and, specifically, members of the host society, as active participants in multiculturalism. As such, it provides a rich case study from which to make recommendations both to further inform Vancouver's own multicultural work as well as that of other cities with a similarly poly-ethnic citizenry. The following recommendations will look at key strategies that Vancouver could undertake to improve its work as well as focusing more broadly on what other emerging poly-ethnic cities around the world could do to engage in effective multicultural work. The recommendations have been divided into five general sections: organizational recommendations, training recommendations, recommendations for other municipal multicultural initiatives and, finally, recommendations for provincial and federal levels of government.

### *Organizational Recommendations*

#### *Reenergize Multicultural Initiatives*

One of the key recommendations that came out of this research was that the City of Vancouver needs to rekindle the energy, innovation, and excitement that set the tone for its early multicultural initiatives such as the Hastings Institute. While it is important to note that the societal mood around diversity and multiculturalism may not be as engaged and receptive as it once was, the City has a role to play in creating and reinvigorating this societal dialogue. Instead of relying on its tried and true approaches, the City needs

to be pushing boundaries and engaging its citizenry in an active multicultural dialogue. Recently (in 2005), the City introduced the Mayor's Working Group on Immigration which is linked to the Federation for Canadian Municipalities Big Cities Mayors Caucus Immigration Working Group. This working group represents an exciting opportunity for the City to reinvigorate its multicultural initiatives through critically reflecting on its own work. It also represents an important vehicle through which the City (in partnership with the other organizations and businesses which make up the working group) can take positions and make recommendations on important issues such as barriers to employment faced by immigrants or the need for Canada as a nation to rethink its approach to multiculturalism in order to engage all citizens in mutual co-adaptation. The need to keep multicultural work fresh and engaged is an important observation for other cities or municipalities wanting to carry out similar work, as well. An understanding that the building of a truly multicultural city and society is a long term, multi-generational task, should be built into organizational planning for these initiatives to ensure that steps are in place to move the work forward and to keep its approaches relevant and engaging.

#### *Diversify City Staff*

Another key organizational recommendation that came out of this research was the idea that the City of Vancouver, and the Hastings Institute/ EEO itself, needs to further focus on the diversification of staff. While it was acknowledged that the City had gone a ways towards diversification in the last 20 years, a number of interviewees felt the City still has a ways to go in terms of modeling the kind of approach its citizens could be taking to welcoming diversity. The Equal Employment Opportunity program is valuable in its work towards ensuring that applicants for positions at, and employees of, the City

of Vancouver are not discriminated against, and if they are, that they have a vehicle through which to launch a complaint. However, there is still much to be done in terms of explicit policies which aim to incorporate those with barriers to employment into the organization, from people with physical disabilities to new immigrants whose foreign professional accreditation is not being accepted.

### *Training Recommendations*

#### *Focus on Transformative and Anti-racism Approaches*

The key recommendation concerning training that comes out of this research is the need to focus on more transformative training approaches. Approaches used in the early Kingswood programs such as role-playing and scenarios were largely seen as the most effective approach by past trainees. Currently, the harassment intervention approach of Hastings Institute/ EEO training focuses only on the most in-your-face aspects of discriminatory behaviour. It doesn't get into underlying societal racism nor the assumptions and biases that are part of our day-to-day lives. These sessions tend to focus on case law, legal definitions and policies which address extreme cases rather than systemic racism and discrimination. In order to address these issues, training needs to focus on broader historical and societal issues. It also needs to incorporate self-reflection which enables trainees to critically examine their own behaviour and understanding and to work towards cultivating what bell hooks has termed a 'radical openness' to difference (2003). A key way identified to get trainees to do this was through co-learning, meaning putting people together (for example having training groups which are composed of members of the host society as well as new immigrants) to learn from each other's experi-

ence. A note of caution for this approach which was raised by one interviewee is to ensure that this is a true sharing of experience rather than a voyeuristic one-way process where members of the dominant society hear tales from "Others'" perspectives.

#### *Follow up and Ongoing Evaluation*

Another key finding of this research was that training should be seen as part of an ongoing process rather than a one-off event. Follow-up to training, for example, taking the next step after awareness-building to look critically at the policies of an organization, is the most effective way to ensure that real organizational transformation occurs. The City of Vancouver, and other organizations undertaking training, should develop long-term plans for how training will be followed up in different departments and areas. Evaluation of training programs is also an important ongoing aspect of training. In order to gauge the effectiveness of their training initiatives, it is key to develop strategies for follow-up evaluation with participants. A key precursor to training should, therefore, be to develop clear goals and objectives of training programs and strategies for evaluating these. Data gathered from evaluations can help to inform future training initiatives. One approach to this is to have programs evaluated by an outside body which can more objectively evaluate its effectiveness. A similar recommendation to this was made in the 1990 impact study of Kingswood training discussed above. It suggested that an external consultant be hired to collect qualitative and quantitative data 6, 12 and 18 months after completion of the training (Berman and Levitan, 1990).

## *Recommendations for Other Municipal Multicultural Initiatives*

### *Civic Re-narration through Dialogue*

Creating community dialogue around issues of diversity, immigration and multiculturalism is another key recommendation that emerges from this research. Many of the interviewees talked about a past initiative carried out by the City of Vancouver, the Barriers to Bridges dialogues, as something that should be attempted once again by the City. Both formal and informal occasions for dialogue should be a key objective for the City of Vancouver and other municipalities hoping to engage their populace in active multiculturalism. As the authors in the above section on storytelling outlined, changes in attitude and behaviour come out of lived experience. Creating public dialogue events as well as less-formalized opportunities for what Sandercock calls “banal transgressions” where groups can mix and share their stories, experience, and ideas is key for getting groups to communicate and collaborate across difference. Cities need to focus on opportunities for dialogue to re-narrate the idea of a city as a place where diverse cultures enrich each others lives, rather than create incompatible enclaves.

Opportunities for the host society to renegotiate their own cultural narratives in order to see their shifting role in a polyethnic society is also a key part of civic re-narration. As one interviewee commented, approaches such as community cultural development are key ways in which this can be accomplished. In addition, as community based non-profits such as Neighbourhood Houses are often the loci of such community-based multicultural initiatives, it is vital for cities to work actively with the non-profit sector to create opportunities for dialogue, to support transformative programming, to train their em-

ployees and to provide long-term support to successful cross-cultural projects at the neighbourhood level. Ultimately, this would strengthen the city's initiatives through dispersing them more effectively throughout the city in order to carry out what Sandercock terms "the micro-sociological work that needs to be done street by street, neighbourhood by neighbourhood and across a range of institutions" (Sandercock, 2003: 139).

*Recommendations for Provincial  
and Federal Levels of Government*

*Provide Ongoing Direction and Funding for  
Cross-Cultural Policies and Programs*

In order to create a climate of acceptance for multicultural policy innovations and the resources to make them happen, it is vital that there is a multi-tiered approach in which all levels of government play a role. Senior levels of government must offer cities, which are the loci of immigration, both direction and the long-term funding needed to create effective programs. As outlined in the interviews, the attempt to turn from government funding to private funding to carry out their cross-cultural training work was less than successful for the Hastings Institute and led to the downsizing of the organization's role and status in the city.

Governments need to look at strategies for the creation of long term engagement in cross-cultural dialogue between members of the host society and immigrant populations. Senior levels of government, particularly the federal level, have been the drivers behind immigration policy and the creation of opportunities for new immigrants to come to Canada. As part of their responsibility towards seeing this strategy through, the federal government needs to focus energy and resources on effectively co-integrating new immigrants and

current residents. In order to accomplish this, the federal government needs to explicitly support programming in cities which attract the most immigration. In addition, the federal government should directly engage with the issue of professional accreditation for new immigrants, working with accreditation boards of various professions to determine if, and what kind of, additional training would enable them to practice their professions in Canada. This would be a vital step towards creating an environment conducive to immigration.

*Ongoing Dialogue Regarding  
the Concept of Multiculturalism*

In order to keep the concept of multiculturalism relevant to an evolving citizenry, it needs to be seen as an emerging dialogue rather than a strictly defined concept and set of policies. Generally, Canadians pride themselves on being a multicultural nation. However, in order to have the idea of multiculturalism benefit current residents and newcomers alike, it can't have a static definition. A disengaged multiculturalism can lead to a situation where Canadians become blind to the racism and barriers that groups such as new immigrants (as well as First Nations, and non-Anglo-Saxon long term residents) face. Multiculturalism can no longer be defined by the host culture on its terms only and in a manner that exempts it from engaging actively. This means that Canada and other multicultural societies need to open up to a true discussion about the kinds of racism that are very much alive in their societies. In order to truly move forward on these issues, the federal government needs to make a commitment to keeping the definition of multiculturalism fresh. This entails keeping ongoing discussion alive in communities in order to make multiculturalism a concept that can shift with emerging realities and hybridities. This kind of dialogue should be carried out across the country and could

partly be carried out at a community-level as part of the community forums recommended above.

*Active Provincial Engagement  
with Multiculturalism*

The provincial government needs to take a more active role in multicultural policy and programming. The province could demonstrate a commitment to multiculturalism by moving the multiculturalism branch to an influential location such as the Premier's Office. This would give it the authority it needs to ensure all provincial ministries are integrating the ideals of multiculturalism and participating in the discussion of a renewed and re-defined multiculturalism. The province should also work towards providing an explicit mandate for municipal governments to implement multicultural programs and policies. As well, in order to facilitate the skills needed to foster intercultural coexistence, the province should, through the Ministry of Advanced Education, support universities and colleges in offering programs in diversity training, multicultural programming and inter-cultural communication. In addition to this, the Province should implement mandatory elementary and high school curricula that explicitly address multiculturalism, the roles that both the host culture and newcomers play, and ways for both to co-adapt.

## CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Arguably, it is new immigrants to Canada, experiencing systemic barriers to employment and overall acceptance in Canadian society, who have the most to lose in the current climate where the onus is on immigrants alone to adapt to their new home. They are faced with the expectation that they should integrate into a society that hasn't yet come to terms with their existence and

participation within that society. However, I would argue that Canada's host society loses out as well in this current environment. Firstly, a national schism exists. There is a tension between who we think we are as Canadians, our core story of being a welcoming, tolerant nation, and increasing evidence that points to this being far from the truth. When problems arise within this context, without any exposure to the idea that multiculturalism is about two-way co-adaptation, it is easy for the host culture to blame any friction on newcomers. It becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy: if certain people are seen as a challenge to the existing order, then they likely will be. If the predominant concept of Canadianess doesn't expand, then increasing racism, exclusion and ghettoization will lead to further social unrest in the cities which are the loci of immigration. Fear and misunderstanding will likely dominate. It will become painfully obvious that we aren't the Canada we thought we were. What this clearly points to is the need to address these issues now. Our social policies need to be in sync with our immigration policies. We need to examine approaches such as the Hastings Institute/ EEO that have had some successes in helping the host society to co-adapt, and build upon those successes. If we want people to come to this country, we have to build a society that makes their coexistence with the existing population possible, even fruitful. We need to lay the groundwork now to change fear to curiosity, to see difference as a strength rather than a weakness, and to see the hybridities that emerge from cultures mixing as the foundation for new, exciting, truly cosmopolitan societies.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Au, Wendy. 2000. Planning amidst diversity: Multicultural challenges & strategies in Vancouver. *Plan Canada* 40(4):21–22.
- Baxter, David. 1998. *Just Numbers, Demographic Change and Immigration in Canada's Future*. Vol. 22. Vancouver: The Urban Futures Institute.
- Berman, Sandy and Levitan, Alberta. 1990. *Impact Study of the Kingswood Management Training Program: Equity Principles in Personal and Organizational Change*.
- Canadian Heritage. 2006a. Canadian multiculturalism: An inclusive citizenship. [http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/multi/inclusive\\_e.cfm](http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/multi/inclusive_e.cfm) (accessed July 30, 2006).
- Canadian Heritage. 2006b. Policy and legislative framework. [http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/multi/policy/framework\\_e.cfm?nav=2](http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/multi/policy/framework_e.cfm?nav=2) (accessed July 30, 2006).
- City of North Vancouver. 2000. *Multicultural Policies and Practices in Selected BC Municipalities: Eight Case Studies*. Prepared by Parul R. Penner, available through the Hastings Institute Archives.
- City of Vancouver. 1995. *Proposed 1995 Operating Structure of the Hastings Institute*. Available through the Hastings Institute/ EEO Archives.
- City of Vancouver. 2005. *Harassment Intervention Skills Day 2*. Prepared by the Hastings Institute, available through the Hastings Institute Archives.
- City of Vancouver. 2006a. Equal Employment Opportunity Program (EEO). <http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/eoo/index.htm#EEO> (accessed August 7, 2006).

- City of Vancouver. 2006b. City of Vancouver Mission. <http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/mission.htm> (accessed August 7, 2006).
- City of Vancouver. 2006c. Multiculturalism & Diversity: Civic Policy on Multicultural Relations. <http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/COMMSVCS/SOCIALPLANNING/initiatives/multicult/civicpolicy.htm> (accessed August 7, 2006).
- City of Vancouver. 2006d. Policy report information: City Communications Strategy. <http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/ctyclerk/cclerk/951109/csb1.htm> (accessed August 7, 2006).
- City of Vancouver. 2006e. CityPlan: Directions for Vancouver. <http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/commsvcs/planning/cityplan/dfvf.htm> (accessed August 7, 2006).
- City of Vancouver. 2006f. Cultural Harmony Awards. <http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/multiculturalism/culturalharmony/index.htm> (accessed August 7, 2006).
- Edgington, David W., and Hutton, Thomas A. 2002. Multiculturalism and Local Government in Greater Vancouver. RIIM working paper series no. 02-06. Vancouver: University of British Columbia. <http://riim.metropolis.net/Virtual%20Library/2002/wp02-06.pdf> (accessed August 7, 2006).
- Fleras, Augie, and Elliott, Jean H. Leonard. 1999. *Multiculturalism in Canada: the challenge of diversity*. Scarborough, Ont.: Nelson Canada.
- Friedmann, John. 2002. *The prospect of cities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- GVRD. 2006. GVRD Population Estimates 1995-2005. <http://www.gvrd.bc.ca/growth/keyfacts/popest.htm> (accessed August 19, 2006).

- Hiebert, Daniel, Jock Collins, and Paul Spoonley. 2003. Uneven Globalization: Neoliberal Regimes, immigration, and Multiculturalism in Australia, Canada, and New Zealand. Research in Immigration and Migration Working Paper 03-05. <http://www.riim.metropolis.net/Virtual%20Library/2003/wp03-05.pdf> (accessed August 7, 2006).
- hooks, bell. 2003. *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope*. New York: Routledge.
- Ley, D., and P. Murphy. 2001. Immigration in gateway cities: Sydney and Vancouver in comparative perspective. *Progress in Planning* 55(3):119-194.
- Mackinnon, Angus, Kathy Saucier, and Tim Woodland. 1992. BCIT Directed Studies Project. Interviews collected for the Equal Employment Opportunity Program.
- Mahtani, Minelle. 2002. Interrogating the Hyphen-Nation: Canadian Multicultural Policy and 'Mixed Race' Identities. *Social Identities* 8(1):67-90.
- Moodley, Kogila. 1983. Canadian Multiculturalism as Ideology. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 6(3).
- Pestieau, Katherine and Marcia Wallace. 2003. Challenges and Opportunities for Planning in the Ethno-Culturally Diverse City: A Collection of Papers - Introduction. *Planning Theory & Practice* 4(3):253-258.
- Province of British Columbia. 1996. Multiculturalism Act. [http://www.qp.gov.bc.ca/statreg/stat/M/96321\\_01.htm](http://www.qp.gov.bc.ca/statreg/stat/M/96321_01.htm) (accessed August 7, 2006).
- Province of British Columbia (British Columbia Multicultural Advisory Council). 2005. Strategic Framework for Action: A Strategy to Stimulate Joint Action on Multiculturalism and the Elimination of Racism in British

Columbia. <http://www.ag.gov.bc.ca/sam/framework/pdf/framework.pdf> (accessed on August 7, 2006).

Sandercock, L. 2003. *Cosmopolis 2: Mongrel Cities of the 21st Century*. New York: Continuum.

Sandercock, L. 2005. "A Lifelong Pregnancy?" Immigrants and the Crisis of Multiculturalism. Presented at the Simon Fraser University Wosk Centre Dialogue "the Future of Multiculturalism in British Columbia, February 14, 2005."

Statistics Canada. 2001. A National Overview: Population and Dwelling Counts. <http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census01/products/standard/popdwell/tables.cfm> (accessed August 7, 2006).